

# THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

---

## Notes of Recent Exposition.

It is very difficult for the follower of Christ to believe in war. Even now, when war is on us, and we must justify our entering into it, we find great difficulty in giving it a place among the things of Christ. It is not that there are no texts. Such a text as, 'Think not that I came to send peace on the earth: I came not to send peace, but a sword' (Mt 10<sup>34</sup>), occurs at once, and has done much service since the War began. But the quotation of a text is ever a precarious argument. It is the spirit of Christ that we have to do with. And it is very difficult to associate with the spirit of Christ as we know it the things which war now stands for.

And yet Canon SCOTT HOLLAND, who believes in Christ, believes also in war. He believes in war as he believes in earthquakes and avalanches. He may have had his trouble with earthquakes and avalanches. It is not easy to gather them under the providence of God. But, the alternative being atheism, Canon SCOTT HOLLAND has found a place for them there. And there also he has been able to find a place for war.

Canon SCOTT HOLLAND has been preaching on peace and war. His sermon will be found in the August issue of *The English Church Review*. The normal thing in the providence of God, he says, is peace. God gives us peace, great spaces of it, and He and we say little about it. But at the end of a

great stretch of peace comes war. It always comes. The peace may have been long and very profitable. Throughout all its length we sat comfortably under our vine and fig-tree. Our corn and wine increased. We did not long for war and we did not look for it. But it came. It always comes. Very likely it comes when least expected and least desired. But it always comes. For it also is part of the providence of God.

War comes for judgment. During the time of peace we had the opportunity given us, not of becoming enriched with goods—that is of little consequence in the providence of God; but of becoming rich in goodness, of gaining a strong character, of doing justly, loving mercy, and walking humbly with our God. Have we used the quiet time of peace in that way? War—or it may be earthquake or avalanche, but usually it is war—war comes to test us. It is our day of judgment, our day of visitation, or simply our Day.

Now Canon SCOTT HOLLAND says that the issue is decided, not by the war, but by the previous peace. For our moral freedom is confined to the time of peace. That, he says, is our Lord's constant warning to us. 'The crisis allows no space for freedom. We cannot help ourselves then. What we are, we are. The light breaks in; the day reveals it. We do, on the sudden,



what is in our nature to do. And since our nature is what it is, we do what we must do. It is no good, then, as the Lord shows in the parable, to wish we could run about and get oil for our lamps. If we have no oil, our lamps are out, and the bridegroom has passed in, and we are shut out. So hard it seems! Yet we have been free all along. We could have got oil any day we chose. We were left perfectly free to get ready. We were in our own power. Now that our nature is formed, no doubt we must do what it dictates. But why did it take that shape? Why have we made this kind of act natural? We might have had a different nature; we might have been changed. There was repentance: and Christ: and forgiveness: and the washing away of sins: and the gift of the Holy Ghost. All these were ours, and quiet years were given us, on purpose that these should have time to do their work upon us. We could draw upon all these resources. We had everything that we needed. We were perfectly free: and we were at peace. And now peace has gone; war is on us, and our freedom is over, and we are, what we are! "We are judged, and there is no help for it!"

But why are we tested by war for what we have made of ourselves in peace? Surely war is a more severe and searching instrument than we need. A character formed in time of peace, should it not be tested by something less terrible? After a long spell of peace, how can we be expected to meet the awful temptation of war?

Canon SCOTT HOLLAND'S answer is a striking one. He says that if we are to be ready for the emergency when it comes, an emergency such as war, we must secure for ourselves a character stronger than the peaceful time seems to require. He admits that this is very difficult to believe. 'We tide along well enough. The days are ordinary, commonplace. We are left alone, as it were; not bothered, not tempted beyond what we are accustomed to. We meet our obligations. We do what decent people ought to do. It does

not cost us very much to keep proper standards, to behave ourselves fairly well. What more do you want? We are quite as good as most people, rather better, in fact. And we are quite sure of ourselves, under all the conditions that are likely to happen. We shall not go wrong or fall away. Trust us! So we say. And it seems so needless, so puny, so troublesome, to be keeping stricter rules of conduct than are necessary, and examining into motives, and worrying over sins. We shall do well enough: so we outwardly feel.'

'And that is exactly where the danger of peace comes in. It tempts us to be content with satisfying the conditions of peace. But what we have to do in peace is to prepare for the hour when peace is over. How foolish to plead, in that hour, "How was I to know that I should fail? I had done well enough in peace." You might just as well plead, "How was I to know that I should break under temptation? I had done well enough when no temptation was attacking me."'

The fourth petition of the Lord's Prayer differs from the other petitions in two ways. In the first place, it is the only petition for the things of the body. And, in the second place, it is the only petition of which the meaning is in dispute. Its meaning is in dispute chiefly because it contains a word which had never been used before.

Dr. E. A. ABBOTT has published a new book; and in the very beginning of it he discusses the meaning of this petition. The new book is a chapter in a forthcoming volume of *Diatessarica*, to be entitled 'The Law of the New Kingdom.' It is published in advance, separately, 'in the hope that it may receive criticism resulting in corrections and improvements, and that it may reach some who would not be likely to read the larger and more expensive work.' Its own title is *Miscellanea Evangelica (II.)*. Published at the Cambridge University Press (3s. net), it is



occupied entirely with an exposition of Christ's Miracles of Feeding.

That is why Dr. ABBOTT enters at once on a discussion of the fourth petition of the Lord's Prayer. For it seems to him that one of the miracles of feeding, the Feeding of the Five Thousand, 'challenges some kind of comparison' with the giving of the manna in the wilderness. Now concerning the manna it is said in Exodus, 'The people shall go out and gather the word of the day in its day'—according to the literal translation. That is to say, the amount necessary for each day was to be gathered on that same day. And it was to be eaten on that same day. None of it was to be left till the morning.

Dr. ABBOTT's mind is at once deflected to the Lord's Prayer. For the fourth petition is strikingly similar. What if the idea in it should prove to be exactly the same? 'Give us this day our daily bread'—what if that should be, quite emphatically, a prayer for just enough bread to serve for the day that we have entered on?

There are two forms of the petition, one in St. Matthew's Gospel, the other in St. Luke's. In St. Matthew we ask for bread for this day, and for this day only. The verb being aorist, makes that unmistakable. 'Give us this day our daily bread.' In St. Luke we ask for a continuous giving of bread. The verb is in the present, the continuous present tense: 'Give us,' we say, '(continuously) day by day our daily bread.'

The difference is difficult to account for. Dr. ABBOTT cannot account for it. All that he can say is that for him the original form is St. Matthew's. For it seems to him that, as in the giving of the manna, so in the Lord's Prayer, emphasis is laid on the day. The promise is not a supply of bread for one day after another, but only for the day we have entered on. And as the promise, so should be the prayer. We are expressly taught to pray, as it seems to Dr. ABBOTT, not for a con-

tinual supply of food, but for food sufficient for this one day.

That is the idea in the Epistle of St. James. 'If,' says St. James (2<sup>15, 16</sup>), 'a brother or sister be naked, and in lack of daily food, and one of you say unto them, Go in peace, be ye warmed and filled; and yet ye give them not the things needful to the body; what doth it profit?' Here Dr. FIELD has pointed out, and Dr. ABBOTT agrees, that it is not a daily supply of food that the brother or sister is in need of, but *the day's* supply. It is even probable that the words used, both by St. James and by our Lord, have in them a hidden but felt contrast to that which is more than sufficient. Dr. FIELD quotes from Menander a line which contrasts the life that is 'dependent on the day's supply' (ἐφήμερος, St. James's word) with the life that has superabundance (περιουσία). And so our Lord may be tacitly teaching us to ask for the one day's supply only, and for only a sufficient supply for that day; and St. James may mean to say that God gives us sometimes the opportunity of fulfilling our own prayers—not by arranging for the supply of a brother's or sister's necessity once for all, but by attending to its supply on the very day on which it is brought to our notice. For in this way the brother or sister will recognize their dependence upon God every day of their lives, and we will consider, every day we pray our prayer, what opportunity of answering it God is to give us *this* day.

From all this it is evident that Dr. ABBOTT has some trouble with the word translated 'daily.' This is the word which appears for the first time in the Lord's Prayer. He is not content to translate it 'daily.' That is the very idea, he believes, that the prayer is intended to discountenance. It is not daily bread that we are taught to pray for, but this day's bread. And it seems absurd to call that bread, which we are to ask for this day only, our *daily* bread.

He takes the word to mean 'belonging to the



coming day.' He understands that the prayer is to be prayed early in the day. The day is yet before us. We pray for bread for the oncoming day. It is not a prayer for the bread of to-morrow, as some have strangely understood it. That could be possible only if the prayer were uttered in the evening; and even then it would probably contradict that immediate dependence upon God's providence to which Christ so often recalls us. It is not 'give us this day the bread of to-morrow.' It is 'give us this day this day's bread.'

---

Now it must be confessed that if that is all that the new word means, it was scarcely worth coining. It is not surprising, therefore, that throughout the history of interpretation other meanings have been found in this word. The latest effort of the kind has been made by Mr. E. S. BUCHANAN, a distinguished critic of the New Testament text. Mr. BUCHANAN's effort is discussed by Dr. RENDEL HARRIS in the *Expositor* for September.

---

Mr. BUCHANAN recently delivered a lecture at the Union Theological Seminary in New York on 'The Search for the Original Words of the Gospel.' Dr. RENDEL HARRIS discusses that lecture. He discusses it in his own way. He begins with the Union Theological Seminary. 'The Union Theological Seminary at New York,' he says, 'is one of the bright spots to scholars who, under various attractions, are drawn to visit the American shores. Here, at least, one is sure of a cultured audience and of spiritual attention, an audience for whom the most scholarly theme will not be too erudite, nor the most inward interpretation of life too mystical. A man with a message could not set his sail for a more pleasant harbour, which in itself will be, in its turn, a point of departure. Apollos, if he had lived in the present day, would have gone there by instinct: I am not quite so sure about Priscilla, as the standard of value may be somewhat affected by the problem of sex.'

He is sure enough, however, that to those of the admitted sex who go there certain advantages belong. They carry with them knowledge, which may possibly have been unappreciated or ill appreciated at home, and the prospect of carrying away its proper equivalent. For those who go to lecture at Union Theological Seminary will remember that if grace and gold are ever to agree, New York or Chicago is the proper place for them to demonstrate their reconciliation. 'However, on this point I do not wish to speak too definitely: it might lead to personal questions and cause misunderstandings—as, for example, when, on my last visit to America, the Income Tax Commissioners of the city of Birmingham implored me to disclose to them what was the net value of the trip; and I do not think they would have been satisfied if I had served them with the proverbial reply that a rolling stone does not gather any appreciable, or dutiable, moss.'

---

'By the way,' he continues (for, as we have said, Dr. RENDEL HARRIS discusses Mr. BUCHANAN's lecture in his own way), 'the proverb which I am quoting has some interesting analogies: in the *Imitatio Christi* there is a sentence to the effect—"Qui multo peregrinantur raro sanctificantur," which means that they who make many pilgrimages are seldom saints. This obvious meaning was overlooked by one of the great translators of the *Imitation*, who gave us instead the dictum that "Those who travel much are seldom saints." This also I am not prepared to dispute: if it is true, it is another form of the doctrine of the rolling stone, the moss in this case being the outward and visible signs of sanctity.'

---

Thus Dr. RENDEL HARRIS approaches Mr. BUCHANAN's lecture. 'Mr. E. S. Buchanan is one of the younger race of Oxford Biblical students; he has been for years occupied in the examination of Old Latin Texts of the Bible, and it was the result of his work on these Old Latin Texts, and I think the hope of obtaining assistance in the prosecution of his thankless research,



that led him to give the lecture which I am now going to describe—not merely to Biblical scholars who know the value of the Old Latin Texts, but still more to those who are interested in religious autobiography; for in connexion with his work, Mr. BUCHANAN has had one of the most interesting religious experiences that could be imagined, and has disclosed the main features of these experiences with a frankness which is as unusual as the experience itself. For certainly we did not expect that a man who comes to lecture on Old Latin Texts would stop to tell us how, in the midst of his studies, he had found his soul. We know that while Saul was seeking his father's asses he found a kingdom, but he did not announce that he would lecture to a school of the prophets on the asses themselves, if I may, for a moment, speak disrespectfully of Old Latin Readings.'

Mr. BUCHANAN, it seems, had lost his soul over the matters of predestination and future punishment. As an undergraduate in Oxford he got into spiritual trouble over words like 'Jacob have I loved, and Esau have I hated,' or 'these shall go away into everlasting punishment,' and such ideas as he had been taught to associate with them. He found his soul in a visit to Dr. JOHN WORDSWORTH. 'I am editing,' said the Bishop of Salisbury to him, 'I am editing the Latin Vulgate myself, and studying the Old Latin readings, and I find that instead of the verse which says, "they shall go into the eternal torture," the oldest Latin MSS. say "eternal fire."'

'Now to most of us,' remarks Dr. RENDEL HARRIS, 'this would not constitute an appreciable relief, but with the young Buchanan it was entirely different; he saw the way out. He courageously mounted on the first various reading that came along, and rode off in search of religious liberty. As I say, one would not have thought the particular beast that he mounted would have carried him far, but it did. He went back to his rooms with the determination to become a New Testament student and a textual

critic, and eventually Bishop Wordsworth became his patron and helped him until his death out of his ripe scholarship and, what does not often go with ripe scholarship, his adequate revenues.'

Well, it was in pursuit of his studies as a textual critic that Mr. BUCHANAN came to the fourth petition of the Lord's Prayer. He had been collating certain Irish manuscripts. Now the Irish manuscripts which he had been working among are in Latin, and their text is an older text than the Vulgate. Here and there, however, they have been altered to agree with the Vulgate, these alterations being sometimes made by writing the Vulgate text over the original, after a little scraping. In one of the manuscripts he found that the Vulgate form of the words, 'Give us this day our daily bread,' had been written over an erasure. 'Was it possible to find out what was there before the scribe wrote the traditional sentence? There came a bright day in April when his keen and practised eye was able to read the underscript, and to his astonishment he found the words, "Give us to-day for bread the Word of God from Heaven."'

Here is a new rendering of the new Greek word. Here is a new petition. It is no longer a prayer for the things of the body, but for the things of the spirit. If this translation is right, the Lord's Prayer from beginning to end is a prayer for spiritual blessings.

Mr. BUCHANAN is positive that the Old Latin reading was 'Panem verbum Dei celestem da nobis hodie' ('Give us to-day for bread the Word of God from Heaven'). And Dr. RENDEL HARRIS thinks we need not doubt his expert eye. But granting that this was the Old Latin reading, are we bound to say that it represents the meaning of the words spoken by our Lord? Mr. BUCHANAN is sure that it does. Dr. RENDEL HARRIS is not so sure.

For Origen, in his treatise *De Oratione*, studies



the Lord's Prayer clause by clause. When he comes to the petition for daily bread, he declares it impossible that the petition can be for the bread of this body. That would be to pray for something which is at once earthly and insignificant. What Christ bids us pray for, says Origen, must be something great and heavenly. And what can that be but Himself? 'I am that bread of life.' It is His flesh. 'The bread that I shall give is my flesh.' Now this flesh, says Origen, is the Logos or Word of God which came down from Heaven. Dr. RENDEL HARRIS concludes that the Old Latin reading which Mr. BUCHANAN has discovered in the Irish manuscript is simply a gloss out of Origen's commentary on the passage.

He knows, of course, and he knows that Mr. BUCHANAN will not delay to remind him, that the spiritual interpretation of the fourth petition of the Lord's Prayer is older than Origen. Tertullian also wrote a tract *De Oratione*, and in that tract he also expounds the clauses of the Lord's Prayer. And when he comes to the prayer for daily bread, he takes it first to be a prayer for natural blessings, but immediately corrects himself. 'We prefer to understand it spiritually,' he says. And then he uses the words, 'Panis est sermo Dei vivi, qui descendit de caelis' ('The bread is the Word of God who came down from heaven'). The words are not identical with those which Mr. BUCHANAN found in his manuscript, but they are strongly suggestive of them.

It is possible, therefore, that the Old Latin reading of Mr. BUCHANAN's Irish manuscript is *not* a gloss from Origen, but an interpretation of the petition that is older than Origen. Who can tell how old? Dr. RENDEL HARRIS cannot tell, and leaves it there.

Among the arguments that are used to disprove the divinity of Christ, there is one that has some plausibility and much popularity at the present

time. It is the argument that a Being so exalted would be useless as an example.

It is an argument, however, that, apart from its popularity with the thoughtless, tells with any force of conviction only upon those who cherish a certain theory of human nature. The theory is that in all the history and in all the geography of the world human nature is very much alike. It has not sunk so low on the whole as some theologies declare, such language as 'wounds and bruises and putrefying sores' being altogether out of place. Nor has it risen so high as, curiously enough, the very same theologies claim. It is very much of a piece, and it has been very much of a piece since the beginning.

Miss E. M. CAILLARD does not believe that. Does any one ask, Who is Miss E. M. CAILLARD? Surely not. Her *Progressive Revelation* cannot have been wholly missed by anybody, though it may not have deeply influenced everybody. But at present we introduce Miss CAILLARD as the author of *The Church and New Knowledge* (Longmans; 2s. 6d. net). This is one of the volumes of the 'Layman's Library,' a series which is edited by Professor BURKITT and Professor NEWSOM. These men chose the previous volumes of their series with discrimination, and we may be confident that they have not made a mistake in choosing this volume.

Miss CAILLARD does not believe in a dead level of attainment for the race. And still less does she believe in its incapacity for progress. She admits that we are constantly falling back upon some weak compromise of life and conduct. But why? For two reasons. First, because we have not before us the standard of the Ideal Man. And next, because we forget the promise of power to reach that standard through the Divine Man.

Miss CAILLARD speaks of the Ideal Man and the Divine Man. Are these different men, or one and the same? They are one and the same.



Christ is the Divine Man who gives men the power to reach the standard of true manhood—that, if you will, through the Divinity that dwells in Him. And Christ is the Ideal Man, through the humanity that is His. With all diversity of attainment, no one has yet risen to the full stature of manhood in Christ Jesus. But that stature is attainable, for He is Man. And that stature will be attained, for He is God and will see to it.

---

What, then, is the stature of manhood in Christ Jesus? Miss CAILLARD says that it consists of four elements. These elements are all attainable; for they were all present during the life on earth of the Man Christ Jesus. But He was God on earth as well as Man? He was; but He veiled His Godhead. Born under the law, He submitted to the restrictions of law, and even of custom in so far as they did not hinder His self-manifestation as a Man, or the work which had been given Him to do.

---

The first element of manhood which Miss CAILLARD sees in the Man Christ Jesus upon earth is His perfect control of His own physical organization. His human body was no hindrance to Him. By means of it He did His work. It was the obedient servant of His will. It suffered, certainly. Throughout the hours of the Passion it suffered in a supreme degree. But it never gained the upper hand, or stood between Him and the work which His Father in heaven had given Him to do.

---

He was not anxious about the body, or the things of the body. He carried out His own precept, 'Take no thought for the body.' When spiritual necessity came upon Him, He did not hesitate to place the body under a stress which might well have appeared excessive. It was so during the Temptation in the Wilderness. He made every demand upon the body that His work required. But He made none out of presumption. When invited to fling Himself from the pinnacle of the Temple, He refused. That was no part of

the work which the Father had given Him, and the body should not be asked to bear it. If it had been part of His work, no physical shrinking would have deterred Him from the daring act. He would have thrown Himself over in absolute confidence that God would bear the body up.

---

Here, then, at once, is a most severe test for us. Perhaps we shall find none severer. Can we make our body thus the instrument of our will? We can. The follower of Christ made no boast who said, 'I can do all things in him that strengtheneth me.' We must see to it, certainly, that we do not call upon the body for that which is no proper part of our life and service. But within the sphere of God's purpose we may believe that the healthy body will respond to every legitimate call that is made upon it.

---

The second element of manhood which Miss CAILLARD sees in the Man Christ Jesus is His control of Nature. This surprised the men of His time more than anything else. Perhaps it is our greatest surprise also. We can accept His miracles of healing while we hesitate over His feeding of the five thousand, His walking on the water, or His stilling the storm on the lake. And at first nothing seems to be further away from our accomplishment. In whatever else we take Him as example, we do not even turn to Him for an example in this.

---

But it is not the nature *miracles* that Miss CAILLARD is thinking of. It is of His ordinary attitude to the surroundings and circumstances of the life He lived. The point to observe is that He used these circumstances, just as He used His body, as the instruments of His will. He seems to have felt no restraint. He complains of none. He lived in a certain place, at a certain time, among a certain class of men and women; and He lived His full, free, perfect life so. The restraints that the great so often find irksome and hampering, were no hindrance to Him. He said, it is true, 'The Son of man hath not where



to lay his head,' but not in the way of complaint, only in the way of warning. His homelessness He accepted as He accepted an occasional home, doing His work unhindered by circumstances of any kind.

---

And this control of daily circumstance was altogether in line with that control of nature which so greatly amazes us. It was in the exercise of His work that He turned the water into wine, and said to the wind, 'Peace, be still.' We cannot follow Him in these acts. But we have an unquenchable conviction that the reason why we cannot is that we have not faith enough. We can never rid our minds of His words, 'If ye have faith as a grain of mustard seed, ye would say unto this sycamine tree, Be thou rooted up, and be thou planted in the sea; and it would have obeyed you.' Peter was a man of like passions such as we are, and if he had had faith enough he could have walked on the sea as Jesus was walking on it.

---

It may be, then, that faith has not yet brought us into fulness of fellowship. We cannot help believing that it is so. But meantime it is in the daily circumstances of life that we shall find our great example in Christ. We too have our work—work which the Father has given us to do, and we may do it under any circumstances of life, if we keep the standard of the Ideal Man before us, and believe in the promise of power through the Divine Man.

---

The third element of manhood which Miss CAILLARD sees in Christ is His perfect insight into and sympathy with His fellow-men.

---

Now these are not two, but one. The sympathy and the insight are inseparably united. If it were not so we should be able to take Jesus as our

example in sympathy alone; His insight into men we should set apart and far above us. We think Him never nearer us than when He had compassion on the woman that stood behind Him weeping. We think Him never further from us than when He knew what Simon the Pharisee was thinking and answered the unspoken thought. But His pity for the woman and His insight into the Pharisee's heart were one.

---

And in this at least we have no doubt, in these days of ours, that we can make Him our example. We have learned the lesson that love is the key to knowledge. It is just the progress which we have made toward an understanding of this element of our Lord's manhood, the assurance we have that in this matter we can really follow His wonderful example, that gives us confidence to believe that we can follow Him everywhere else.

---

The last element is His perfect sense of Sonship to God. This is the great marvel of His life, but it is least marvelled at. He called God Father. We also call Him Father. He prayed to Him. We can pray to Him also. He obeyed His will: He said, on occasion of a great decision, 'Not my will, but thine, be done.' We can say the same, in the measure of our faith and love and surrender. There is no need to exhibit the possibility of taking the Ideal Man as our example here. We take Him here if we take Him anywhere. And yet this is the element that enters into all the rest and makes them possible. It was the sense of Sonship that made the body His willing instrument; it was the sense of Sonship that gave Him control over Nature; it was His Sonship to God that enabled Him to recognize brotherhood in man. And all these things will be possible to us when we realize that we are sons of God in Christ Jesus our Lord.

---



## A Group of Hebrew Names of the Ninth Century B.C.

BY THE REV. G. BUCHANAN GRAY, D.LITT., D.D., PROFESSOR OF HEBREW AND OLD TESTAMENT EXEGESIS IN MANSFIELD COLLEGE, OXFORD.

IN the years 1908-1910 Harvard University was engaged in exploring and excavating the site of the city of Samaria. Among the most interesting, if not the most interesting, of the objects discovered were seventy-five *ostraka*, that is to say, potsherds on which, after fracture, inscriptions were written in ink with a reed pen. Of these inscriptions Professor Lyon of Harvard University gave some account in an article entitled 'Hebrew Ostraca from Samaria,' and published in the *Harvard Theological Review* for January 1911. This article was based on a special report of Professor Reisner, who was in charge of the excavations. At the time notice was taken of Professor Lyon's article in more than one publication: and I may refer in particular to an article entitled, 'The Discoveries at Samaria,' by the late Dr. Driver in the *Palestine Exploration Fund Quarterly Statement* for April 1911, in which some extravagant rumours as to the nature of the discoveries at Samaria were corrected, and to Father Abel's contribution to the *Revue Biblique* for April 1911, pp. 290-293, which contained some useful suggestions for identifying some of the places mentioned in the inscriptions.

One of the false rumours to which I have alluded claimed that there had been found at Samaria 'an Assyrian cuneiform inscription mentioning the name of Ahab and the contemporary king of Assyria.'<sup>1</sup> But although Ahab's name had not been found, the names of more than thirty individuals, who were probably his contemporaries, occur in the inscriptions and were communicated by Professor Lyon in his article. Presumably many other individuals of the same generation are mentioned on the inscriptions not given by Professor Lyon.

A group of Hebrew names of the ninth century B.C. is on many grounds sufficiently interesting to have attracted at the time and since more attention than these have obviously done. And for myself such a group had a peculiar interest. In my

*Studies in Hebrew Proper Names* (1896), with a view to bringing out the different complexion of groups of Hebrew names belonging to different periods or different circles, I analyzed on pp. 183 ff. eight groups of names; the first group was of pre-Davidic names, the second of contemporaries of David, the third of contemporaries of Jeremiah. The chronological gap between the second and third of these groups was regrettably great; but, as I was obliged to say at the time, 'unfortunately no sufficiently long and typical list of names' from the intervening period could be obtained. The *ostraka* from Samaria supply what was then lacking.

A very good reason why scholars have been slow to discuss this singularly interesting group of names or other features in the inscriptions is to be found in the fact that Professor Lyon's article contained only a selection from the inscriptions, and that only in translation. Unfortunately we remain in the same imperfect state of information; still no facsimiles, still even no Hebrew text of the inscriptions, still not all of the inscriptions even in translation are published. And that being so, since it is always disagreeable to express a judgment on partial evidence when other evidence is known to exist but is kept inaccessible, I should still refrain from discussing the names but for one reason. Learned bodies may observe a dignified leisure in publishing evidence which they have collected, but editors of encyclopædias grow insistent; and one of these has called upon me to redeem a promise which I made some years ago to contribute an article on Hebrew proper names to the *Encyclopædia of Religion and Ethics*. I have therefore been compelled to make the best use I could of the partial and imperfect evidence with regard to these names on the Samaritan *ostraka*; and as a result of my examination certain points of some general interest have come to light, and it seems possible to make also one or two suggestions that may be of use in editing the complete material.

The date assigned for the *ostraka*, viz. the

<sup>1</sup> See *Palestine Exploration Fund Quarterly Statement*, 1911, p. 2.



ninth century B.C., and in particular, perhaps, the reign of Ahab (yet see below), I accept provisionally from Professor Lyon. The *ostraka*, we are told, were discovered at the same level as a vase inscribed with the name of Osorkon II. of Egypt, who, if correctly assigned to the years 874-853 B.C. (Breasted), was a contemporary of Ahab (c. 876-854 B.C.). The script also may point somewhat decisively to the ninth century, but on this point the information given is vague. The script on the *ostraka* is said to be 'practically identical with that of the Siloam Tunnel inscriptions'; it is also said to be the same as that of the Moabite stone; the latter certainly belongs to the ninth century and mentions Ahab of Israel as contemporary with its author Mesha of Moab.

But the Siloam inscription and the inscription of Mesha, though they agree in showing the ancient Phœnician script as distinct from the later square Hebrew characters, are far from being identical scripts. On the other hand, while most authorities have assigned the Siloam inscription to the eighth century B.C., the differences from the Moabite inscription are such that others have assigned it to a date some centuries later. Whether, as Professor Lyon claims, the *ostraka* will really settle 'at a stroke the disputed question whether that inscription [*i.e.* the Siloam inscription] can be as old as the time of Hezekiah' will really turn on two other questions: (1) whether there is a sufficiency of evidence, independent of epigraphy, to prove that the *ostraka* were written in the ninth century; (2) whether the alphâbet used in the *ostraka* more closely approximates to that on the Moabite stone, or that on the Siloam inscription; for since these two alphabets differ, that of the *ostraka* cannot be identical with both of them.

I accept provisionally, then, the ninth century B.C. as the date of the *ostraka*; and start, therefore, from the assumption that the names of contemporaries mentioned on them are names of individuals living in the ninth century B.C. If, when the full archaeological and epigraphical evidence is available, it is less conclusive as to date than we could wish, then I think it will be found that the general complexion of this group of names favours at all events a date between David and Jeremiah, *i.e.* between the tenth and the seventh centuries, and points somewhat clearly to a date nearer the earlier than the later term.

The form of the twelve inscriptions given in

translation by Professor Lyon is in general similar, though not identical, in all the inscriptions. One may serve as illustration here: No. 12 reads: 'In the tenth year. From Yaşat. A jar of fine oil. For 'Akhino'am.'

Professor Lyon, no doubt rightly, regards Yaşat (which follows the preposition 'from') as the name of a place, 'Akhino'am (which follows the preposition 'for') as the name of a person. He also regards as names of places Shaphtan and Saq; these also in the inscriptions given by him follow the preposition 'from,' and that, as in the inscription given above, in the clause immediately following the date. Whether the other place names cited by him — SKM (= Shechem), Khaşeroth, 'Azâ, Qaşah—also stood in similar clauses we are not informed; but I am inclined to suspect that they did, and that this fact has weighed with Professor Lyon in treating them also as (probably) names of places; for with the exception of Shechem and Khaşeroth, which, if written חצרת, is identical in form with a name in Nu 33, none of the names cited in this paragraph occur as place names in the Old Testament, though, since the appearance of Professor Lyon's article, Father Abel, as I have already remarked, has pointed out resemblances to some of these names in modern place names of Central Palestine. But not all the names following 'from' even in the inscriptions which he gives are classed by Professor Lyon as place names; Sarar is not classified at all; 'Abi'ezer, Shemida', and Khelek, all of which occur in the clauses immediately following the date, are classed as personal names; so also is Elmathan, which Professor Lyon considers to be an error for Elnathan. This last name occurs not like the rest immediately after the date clause, but after the names of the recipients (introduced by 'for') which in turn follow the clause 'from Abiezer'; *i.e.* 'from Elmathan' is a second 'from' clause in the same inscription.

Now, were the names Sarar, Shemida, Abiezer, Khelek, which are preceded by the preposition 'from,' like 'Akhino'am and other names which are introduced by the preposition 'for,' names of individuals living when the *ostraka* were written? There is, of course, nothing in the mere use of the preposition 'from' to indicate that a geographical rather than a personal name follows; on the other hand, in a group of closely related inscriptions, such as these *ostraka* are, similarity of formula is



to be expected; and therefore, if origin was certainly defined by place in some cases, it is safer, in the absence of convincing reasons to the contrary, to assume that it was not defined by individuals in other cases. But have we not convincing reasons in the case of at least Abiezer and Shemida to assume that some of the names following 'from' are personal, and not geographical? Are not Abiezer and Shemida, primarily at least, personal names? We must immediately not merely admit but insist that Abiezer and Shemida were *primarily* personal names: the compounds with Ab, Abi form an important and numerous group of Hebrew personal names, and the first element of Shemida appears also in Samuel, and in all probability has its analogy in the early Babylonian personal names, derived perhaps from the western Semitic, Sumu-abi and Sumu-la-ilu, and in a group of South Arabian personal names including Sumhu-kariba, Sumhu-apika, and Sumhu-yada'a, of which the last is the exact equivalent of Shemida, which should rather be pronounced Shemyada.<sup>1</sup> Sarar and Khelek are more ambiguous; Khelek means *portion*, and, like Khelkath (E.V. Helkath) with the same meaning, might well be a geographical name: still it could, if need be, be explained as a personal name. If all other names following 'from' were geographical, Khelek might safely be treated as geographical also; and even if some of the names in question are geographical and some personal, the probability that Khelek was geographical would be greater than that it was personal.

Shemida, Abiezer, and perhaps Khelek, were *primarily* personal names; but are they in these inscriptions names of *contemporary individuals*? That is a fresh question, and it is by no means certain that it should be answered in the affirmative. For the three names in question appear together in the Old Testament as the names of Manassite (Gileadite) *clans* (Jos 17<sup>2</sup>, Nu 26<sup>29-32</sup>); and it is certain that one at least of these clans, Abiezer, existed long before the ninth century B.C. (Jg 8<sup>2</sup> 6<sup>11, 24</sup>); and, though the other clans are mentioned only in P and Chronicles, they may well have been equally ancient. I note further that the name of another Manassite clan, Shechem, mentioned in the same Old Testament passages, occurs in these inscriptions. I suggest that the

names preceded by the preposition 'from' in the clauses following the date define the origin of the produce by reference to the place whence it came, or the clan (but not the individual) who supplied it; then the rather large proportion of the names of Manassite clans to the whole of these place or clan names is reasonably explained: for produce supplied to Samaria might well come largely from the neighbouring Manassite country. On the other hand, if four or, treating Shechem as geographical, three of the six names of Manassite clans reappear here as names of *individuals* living in the ninth century, we have a curious coincidence. The unpublished inscriptions may increase or diminish the probability of my suggestion; meantime the possibility, not to say the probability, that Abiezer, Shemida, Khelek were not individuals who received their names in the ninth century, but clans who had then already borne these names for centuries, had better be kept in view.

One inscription which contains the clause 'from Abiezer' also contains, at its close in the copy used by Professor Lyon, the clause 'from Elmathan.' Professor Lyon considers this to be an error for 'from Elnathan'; Elnathan is of course a personal name. If the inscription actually contains the name Elnathan, then in one case at least the name of an individual follows the preposition 'from' though not in a clause that occupies the same position as those which we have so far considered. If מאלמתן is the reading, the nature of the name is less obvious.

I conclude this part of the discussion by grouping together (1) the names cited by Professor Lyon as names of places; (2) the further names which appear to me to be possibly names of places or clans, and therefore like those under (1) anterior to the ninth century. I mark with an asterisk the names identical with names of Manassite clans. The group as a whole, or in its two parts, has a significant difference of complexion from the names which we have yet to consider.

(1) Shechem \*  
Khaseroth  
Shaptan  
'Azâ  
Yaşat  
Raşah  
Sağ

(2) 'Abi'ezér \*  
Shemida \*  
Kheleq \*  
Sarar

<sup>1</sup> Cp. S. R. Driver, *Hebrew Text of the Books of Samuel*<sup>2</sup>, pp. 18 f.



In passing now to the names of contemporary individuals mentioned in the *ostraka*, I give at once a list composed from the names given in the list on p. 141 of Professor Lyon's article, together with others not included in his list but incidentally mentioned in his article. The names which, though treated by Professor Lyon as personal, I have just shown may rather be names of clans or places I repeat in this list, but enclose them in square brackets; I also bracket one other name for reasons given below. The list of contemporary individuals is as follows:—

'Abiba'al	Khanan
[ 'Abi'ezer]	Khanan'am
'Abino'am	Yeda'yo
'Akhimelek	Yôyada'
'Akhino'am	Yôyashib
'Aphsakh	Yô'ash
'Elâ	Mariba'al
'Elish (? = 'Elisha')	Maranyo
'Elisha'	Nathan
'Elbâ	'Abdâ
[El <sup>n</sup> athan]	'Egelyo
'Asâ	Uzzah
Ba'ala	Raphâ
Ba'alzamar	Sheba'
[Ba'alâzakar]	[Shemida']
Ba'alme'oni	Shemaryo
Gadyo	Zeker
Gera	
Kheles	
[Khelek]	

Between this list and that which precedes it, it may suffice to call attention to one difference of complexion: in the first list less than a fifth of the names are compounds, in the second more than a half.

With regard to the personal names, Professor Lyon has already pointed out that a great many of them occur in the account of the reign of David. What I wish to make clear is that the *group* as a whole resembles the group of names of David's contemporaries in 2 S 9-20 (which I have classified in *H.P.N.* pp. 272), with certain differences pointing to a slight development towards what we find in the later groups of Jeremiah's contemporaries, and of Ezra's contemporaries whether lay (Ezr 10<sup>25-43</sup>) or priestly (Ezr 10<sup>18-22</sup>). Had I guessed beforehand what features a list of names of Ahab's contemporaries would possess I should have said:

Probably half or more than half the names will be compounds, more than half of these compounds will contain either the element Yah(weh) or El, the former being much more numerous than the latter; the remaining compounds will include names containing Ab, Ah, 'Am, possibly also compounds with Melek, Ba'al, and 'Adon. Finally, in the compounds with Yah, the divine name is likely to be as often the second element as the first, perhaps it will be more often the second element. In all these guesses I should have been right except that there is no compound with 'Adon, and that there are more compounds with Ba'al than I should have anticipated. I have in this way presented what appear to me to be some of the chief features in the complexion of this group of names. Like all groups it contains many individual names that are on one ground or another ambiguous, and to discuss these ambiguities at length would exceed the space at my disposal. But I will refer in a little more detail to some of the clearer or more important features of the group, and conclude with the interesting question raised by the Ba'al names.

The compounds with Yah, here both at the beginning and end of words written Yo, are clear: they number eight;<sup>1</sup> in three the divine element stands first—Yoyada', Yoyashib, Yo'ash; in five it stands second—Gadyô, Yeda'yô, Maranyô, Egelyo, Shemaryo. The total number of names in the list is 37, but some or all of the five bracketed names should perhaps be omitted; *i.e.* out of a maximum of 37, a minimum of 32 names, eight are compounds with Yah, or more than a fifth and perhaps as many as a quarter of the whole number. This proportion is very slightly greater than that in the group of David's contemporaries mentioned in 2 S 9-20, where the compounds with Yah form exactly a fifth of the whole (9 out of 45); it is very strikingly less than among the contemporaries of Jeremiah, where names of this type constitute nearly two-thirds of the whole (53 out of 87: see further *H.P.N.* 185 f.).

If we consider the place occupied by the divine name in the compounds, the movement away from the Davidic list is more conspicuous. Yah stands

<sup>1</sup> Or nine, if Badyo, given in the translation of No. 51, be really distinct from Gadyo. As Professor Lyon says that the reading of the first letter is doubtful, I suspect that it may be Gadyo. If Badyo is correct, cp. Ba-da-ya-a-ma = בדיה in the Nippur tablets.



first in six out of the nine Davidic compounds; in only three out of eight of the names mentioned in the *ostraka*. In the later periods names in which the divine element stands not first but *last* are much the more frequent (*H.P.N.* 162).

Remembering that compounds with 'Ab, 'Ah, and 'Am were all on the decline not long after the Davidic period (*H.P.N.* pp. 22-75), we may note that the *ostraka* show two (or including Abiezer, three) compounds with 'Ab, two with 'Ah, and one with 'Am out of a total of 37 (or 32); the Davidic list four compounds with Ab, three (or including חרש, four) with 'Ah, and two (or including עמשא, three) with 'Am out of a total of 45; *i.e.* in this respect the *ostraka* group closely resembles the Davidic group.

The number of compounds with El is not clear: Professor Lyon counts two certain—Elisha and Elnathan, and three others possible—Elish, Elba, Elâ. Elâ is etymologically ambiguous: the reading of Elnathan is not certain: it is not clear whether Elish is really different from Elisha. On the other hand, Elbâ is probably enough an abbreviation (caritative) of a name compounded with El, Elbaal, Elberech, or the like. Two compounds with El at least, four probably at most, occur in the 37 (or 32) names of the *ostraka*; as against two among 45 contemporaries of David, nine among 87 of Jeremiah's contemporaries.

One further point: according to my classification of the names in 2 S 9-20, the compound names numbered 22, the simple names 23; or, transferring three ambiguous names from the simple to the compound names, the numbers are compound 25, simple 20. In the names of the *ostraka* the numbers are—compound 18, simple 14, if we exclude the bracketed names; or compound 22, simple 15, if we include them. Again, the movement is perhaps slightly, but only slightly, away from the typical Davidic group towards later groups where the compounds greatly predominate. In the Davidic group compounds with either Yah or El are exactly equal in number to all other compounds, each class containing eleven; unless we include in the compounds עמשא חרש, in which case the figures are—compounds with Yah and El, 11; other compounds, 14. In the *ostraka* the compounds with Yah and El number 10 to 12, and equal or slightly exceed in number all the other compounds, which number 8 to 12 according to

the view taken of the bracketed or otherwise ambiguous names. In later lists while compounds with El and Yah are numerous, compounds other than those with El and Yah form at most a trivial proportion.

However regarded, this group of names is seen to cling closely to the nomenclature of the Davidic period; and in this fact is perhaps to be found also the real explanation of the number of Ba'al names; that is to say, the presence of Baal names in the *ostraka* was due to the continuous operation of causes that created a similar group of names in the Davidic period, not to the action of some new cause. In my discussion of the Baal names in *H.P.N.* I said (p. 124): 'The broad fact with regard to the Hebrew personal names is that they are not altogether infrequent in and before the Davidic period, but that they entirely disappear afterwards.' The question is, Did they disappear suddenly in the tenth century and revive owing to a fresh cause in the ninth century? Or is the disappearance simply to be placed a little later than I formerly suggested? should we say now: these names are not altogether infrequent in and before the ninth century, but disappear afterwards?<sup>1</sup> And further interesting questions are: What causes created these names in the earlier centuries? What caused their disappearance later?

We have first to consider the actual extent of this group of names: the names appear to be six in number—Abibaal, Ba'ala, Ba'alzamar, Meribaal, Baalazakar, and Baalmeoni. But the last of these, if we are keeping our eyes on causes operative in the ninth century, must certainly be excluded; for Baalmeoni is obviously a gentilic formed from the place name Baal-meon which had been in existence long before the ninth century. The name Baalmeoni was given to the child to mark his birthplace, not to associate him with a Ba'al, and, to anticipate, least of all to associate him with the Baal of Tyre. Again, it is doubtful whether Baalazakar should be included: it appears to be spelt בעלזוכר; and Professor Lyon suggests that this is an error for בעלזאוכר; now as an independent caritative form בעלא is natural enough, but the compound form בעלזאוכר is by no means so likely; and assuming that we ought to

<sup>1</sup> An occasional instance is to be found later, and that as late as the fifth century B.C., if Ba-li-la-a-mâ in the Nippur tablets is rightly equated with בעליה (A. T. Clay, *Murashu Sons*, x. 118, 5. 3).



read  $\aleph$  for  $\beth$ , I suspect that, as in No. 19 as translated by Professor Lyon, the group of letters is to be taken as two names, Ba'alâ [and] Zakar : cp., in Professor Lyon's translation of No. 49, Ba'alâ [and] Ba'almeoni.

We may say, then, that the *ostraka* contain certainly four names that assert or suggest something about a Ba'al, or a child's relation to a Ba'al, and *perhaps* a fifth—Baal'azkar, as I think I should then read rather than Baalâzakar. Now, of eight certain personal names compounded with Ba'al in the Old Testament, seven, and of two obtained by (uncertain) emendation,<sup>1</sup> one, belong to the Davidic age. The number of names of all classes in the Davidic age is greater than that of those on the *ostraka*; but when allowance is made for this I think it may be asserted that no safe argument can be drawn from the *ostraka* that names containing Baal were more popular in the ninth century than in the Davidic period; the causes that produced them in the one period may, therefore, well be the same that produced them in the other.

Professor Lyon apparently takes another view: he connects the Ba'al names of the *ostraka* with 'the great development of Baal-worship in Israel during the reign of Ahab, whose queen, daughter of Ethbaal, king of Tyre, was specially devoted to this cult.' The suggestion would have more probability (1) if Ahab had given to any of his children a name compounded with Ba'al; as a matter of fact all his children contained names compounded with Yah; and (2) if the Ba'al names on the *ostraka* were relatively considerably more numerous than in the Davidic age. If, however, the suggestion were accepted, then another suggestion of Professor Lyon's would have to be abandoned, for the two are inconsistent. He suggests, and so far no doubt rightly, that the years mentioned on the *ostraka* are the years of the reigning king; he adds 'in all probability this was Ahab.' Now the years mentioned are the ninth, tenth, and eleventh; but since the recipients mentioned, viz. Ba'ala, Baalzamar (Baalazakar), cannot have been mere children, they must have received their names anything from ten to fifty or sixty years before Ahab began to reign, and consequently their names cannot have had anything to do with the great development of Ba'al-worship, which took place in his reign.

<sup>1</sup> *H.P.N.* 121 f.

I cannot discuss afresh here the causes of Ba'al names in the Davidic period, or the reference or meaning of Ba'al in these names. I see no reason to abandon the view I adopted in *H.P.N.*, that in such names, as one of them asserts, Yahweh was regarded as a Ba'al, just as he was regarded as an El. But why, then, do they disappear, rather abruptly as it would seem, after the ninth century B.C.? Was it that the reaction against the worship of the Tyrian Ba'al started a dislike of calling Yahweh Ba'al? The explanation is scarcely sufficient, for the popular identification of Yahweh with the local Ba'als still seems to have been current in the days of Hosea, *i.e.* towards the end of the eighth century; and the names of the Ba'als were still frequently in the people's mouths (Hos 2<sup>17</sup>).

Or is the disappearance of the Ba'al names apparent only? Did several names of the period of the monarchy down to the Exile contain the element Ba'al in the original text of the Old Testament, and is the absence of the term Ba'al in our present text merely due to scribal enthusiasm, excited perhaps by Hos 2<sup>17</sup>, for ridding the text of such a name? Now of such scribal corrections of the text we have, in the Books of Samuel as is well known, some evidence; on the other hand, the parallel Hebrew text of Chronicles and the Greek text even of Samuel, in some cases at least, retains Ba'al. It is possible enough that in a few instances Ba'al has been corrected out of the text without leaving trace of its existence anywhere in our existing material. But on the whole the evidence of the *ostraka* seems to me to indicate that in this respect as in others, though the text of the Old Testament has suffered from scribal activity, it has not suffered to anything like the extent that some scholars have suggested. If Ba'al names were in actual Hebrew life so much more frequent than the text of the Old Testament suggests, we should find in such contemporary documents as the *ostraka* a much larger proportion of Ba'al names than we actually do find. So also the entire absence of these names from those parts of the text of the Old Testament which relate to the post-exilic age corresponds to the entire absence of them from the Elephantine papyri: these papyri refer to some four hundred Jews living in the fifth century, and not a single one of these bears a name containing Ba'al.



## In the Study.

### Virginibus Puerisque.

#### I.

#### November Mists.

'There went up a mist from the earth.'—Gn 2<sup>6</sup>.

If every person in church this morning were asked to write down the name of the month they disliked most, I feel sure that November would top the list. Can you boys and girls guess why?

It is because there is something about this month of November that makes a great many people feel out of sorts. You don't like it, I know—that is, unless you chance to have your birthday in it. The weather, you say, is neither one thing nor another. It is not sunny, very rarely frosty; it is, in fact, oftenest misty, and you hate mist. You feel that there is no world on a misty morning.

The other day I read a story of a North American Indian. He had never learnt to read or write; he was a splendid fellow all the same. One night he sat smoking in a cabin which belonged to an Englishman. 'That picture!' he said all of a sudden, pointing to a coloured print which had been torn from a magazine and stuck up on the wall. 'What does it mean?' (It was a picture of Robinson Crusoe.) 'The man leans his head on his hand,' he continued; 'he sits there always. He is unhappy. Why? I do not understand. That picture is all end. It has no beginning. Explain to me.'

The Indian had eyes like you, boys and girls—eyes that loved just to look round on the whole world, and take everything in. The world has been a great series of pictures to you. You remember the spring days, the flowers, your summer holidays, the wild fruit, the harvest, the time of the nuts. Now, in November you can't see anything. It is mist, mist everywhere.

Mist has a bad reputation all round, yet it does seem as if it sometimes tried to make up for things. It not only decorates the grass in the fields and by the hedgerows, but it hovers about the closes of the city, seeking out the spiders' webs and hanging little pearly drops upon them, so that some poor little girl cries, 'How lovely!'

Still you say you *cannot* like it. Now, let me tell you a secret about some grown-up people. They speak little about the matter: they think about it. 'There is no world to be seen on a misty day.' That was what I accused you of saying. Fathers and mothers, and lonely people who are tired or sick, often feel in misty weather that even *heaven* has disappeared. They cannot see it.

Now, there have been people who preached about mist. And they were not always ministers. Many of them were artists. One artist preacher said something like this: 'Every morning before sunrise the valley was filled with mist. What patience was wanted in order to see. The sun had not risen. I knew the grass in the field was green, but unless I gazed and gazed for a long time I could not even catch the wonderful twilight shade of green which had a peculiar beauty.' That artist preached patience, didn't he? Another, a teacher of painting, said to one of his pupils, 'Don't bring me pictures of gorgeous sunsets, or of any merely pretty things; the merest beginner can appreciate these. Go and try to see the beauty there may be in mist, and let me have your thoughts about it.'

And listen to a little sermon by a poet:

Man, do you measure life by its joys or its ills  
Judge by the mist or the sunshine upon the hills?

Is it measureless mist or sunshine your heart  
that fills?

The mist that will flee away with its mirk and  
its chills—

Or the sunshine eternal of God's eternal hills.

Patience too. He thinks of the poor, sad, grown-up people who say to themselves that the mist hides heaven, and God. My boys and girls, many grown-up people do have patience, and with God's help you may learn to have it too. You will pray to Him about it, won't you?

Here is a little verse by George MacDonald:

But while sad thoughts together creep,  
Like bees too cold to sting,  
God's children, in their beds asleep,  
Are dreaming of the spring.

That means patience and hope too.



## II.

## Children of the South Wind.

'The south wind blew softly.'—Ac 27<sup>13</sup>.

To-day we are going to have a talk about South-wind people. Now, of course, the South wind is the exact opposite of the North wind, and so, as you might expect, South-wind people are in many ways the exact opposite of North-wind people.

When we speak of a South wind, we generally think of a soft, gentle breeze. It brings to our mind summer, and flowers, and new-mown grass, just as the North wind recalls to us frost, and snow, and storms.

So the children of the South wind are the quiet, gentle, easy-going people, and they are to be found more among the girls than among the boys.

Now we could not get along without our South-wind people any more than we could without our North-wind friends. They are very soothing and they are very lovable, and it is among them that you must look for the peacemakers of the world.

But the South-wind people are not perfect any more than the North-wind people, and their defects are more likely to spoil their lives than are those of the children belonging to any other wind.

Now the great danger of the South-wind people lies in their softness. They are too yielding, too easily led. Things which would just create opposition in a North-wind person and warn him to don all his armour easily gain the victory over them. They don't like to say 'no'; they don't like to make a fuss; they don't like to be unpopular; and so they give in to temptation rather than make a stand.

I know that there are some gentle people who are much more determined and much more difficult to move than are the noisy people, but I am not thinking of them to-day. I am thinking of the easy-going people who allow themselves to drift rather than make an effort to resist.

And then the children of the South wind are a little, just a little, inclined to laziness. It is a way South winds have. You know that when the South wind begins to blow, a sleepy, lazy feeling comes over us. We want to close our books, and go out to the garden, or into the country to drink in the soft, sweet breezes.

And so South-wind people are rather self-indul-

gent, and fond of ease. They are a little wanting in backbone; they won't stick in; they are lacking in perseverance; and the result is, that people who have much less ability easily pass them in the race of life. Don't you think it is a pity they should be defeated just for the want of a little effort to rouse themselves? Don't you think it is a pity that all their splendid talent should be lost to the world?

For it is from among our South-wind people that we get so many of our poets and our painters. Just because of their dreaminess they can see things that those of us with ordinary, everyday eyes cannot see.

Oh, South-wind people, don't waste your lives! Don't throw away your gifts! If you only will, you can make the world more beautiful for us than the children of any other wind that blows; for you come from the land of sunshine, and you can cause the flowers to blossom, and the little birds to sing.

In the Book of Job we have a picture of the South wind at its worst. It is a picture of a sirocco—the terrible sultry wind which comes from the burning desert, and silences and stills everything before it. The sky is like brass; not a leaf stirs; the birds hide in the thickest shades, and the flocks and herds take shelter in caves. The hot, dry breath of the air seems to burn and scorch to the very bone. And that is a picture too of what South-wind people may become. They may fritter away their lives till they come to nothingness and desolation. All the joy, and beauty, and life may depart from them.

But in the Song of Songs there is another picture—a picture of the South wind blowing upon a garden and filling the air with the scent of sweet spices. And that is a picture of the South wind at its best.

Boys and girls of the South wind, Jesus can make your lives fragrant. It is He alone who can save you from the dangers of your natures. He can make you strong and brave, just as He can smooth away the rough corners of the North-wind people. Some of the South-wind people have become the noblest of men and women. And what He has done before, He can do again. He can turn your softness into firmness, your weakness into strength, your flaws into beauty. Boys and girls of the South wind, won't you give Him a chance?



## III.

## Just Weights.

'Thou shalt not have in thy bag divers weights, a great and a small. Thou shalt not have in thine house divers measures, a great and a small. A perfect and just weight shalt thou have; a perfect and just measure shalt thou have: that thy days may be long upon the land which the Lord thy God giveth thee.'—Dt 25<sup>13-15</sup>.

The work of exploring the ancient cities of Palestine or Babylon is most interesting. There may be nothing to show where the city stood but a large mound or mounds. The houses have fallen and crumbled to dust. The walls have fallen also. Only the large stones of the foundations are left in their place, covered with the ruins, and gradually buried in the dust and sand blown over them, and covered in time with grass and vegetation, or standing in bare heaps. But when the explorer comes with his spade and tools, and carefully opens up this mound, what wonderful things he finds. He can trace the city of thousands of years ago, and tell you where the walls stood, and where the streets, what kind of houses the people had, what race they belonged to, and how they lived. He finds in the houses of these people, so long dead, broken crockery, and he will tell you how it was made, and where. He finds tools of bronze or iron, and he can tell from these the time at which the city flourished. He may dig deeper still, and find tools or weapons of stone which show that still farther back an older race lived on the same spot, and died away, and was succeeded by the people whose remains were found above theirs. There are traces of their altars and high places, and he will tell you what their religion was, and who were their gods. You may imagine yourself going through the street of the living town, and seeing the workmen at work. Here was the potter's workshop, where he made his clay pots and bowls. Here was the carpenter, and here the worker in stone, and here the goldsmith.

Now those who have excavated can tell you a curious thing about this goldsmith. He was found to have had two drawers full of little stone weights. When these were examined, one lot was found to be too light, the other lot was too heavy. Why? Because the heavy weights were used in buying that he might get more than he ought to get, and the light weights were used in selling, that he might

give less than he should give.<sup>1</sup> I wonder if people suspected him of such tricks, but could not prove it? One might think that as his false weights have lain hidden for thousands of years, his sin would never be found out, yet there it is. This kind of dishonesty is very old. It was in use when the Book of Deuteronomy was written. It was necessary to put this law into it: 'Thou shalt not have in thy bag divers weights, a great and a small. Thou shalt not have in thine house divers measures, a great and a small. A perfect and just weight shalt thou have; a perfect and just measure shalt thou have: that thy days may be long upon the land which the Lord thy God giveth thee.'

In these days we have inspectors of weights and measures, whose business it is to see that they are all exactly the same as a fixed standard, and anybody who uses false weights may be punished, so that when we ask for a pound of tea or sugar, we can be sure that we shall always get the same quantity.

But it is not only the grocer who weighs things. We are all weighing and measuring things in one way or another. When we read some story of cruelty and wrong, like *Uncle Tom's Cabin*, and indignation rises in our hearts, we are weighing the people who did those things and finding them bad weight. In this way we weigh everybody we have to do with, when we meet some one we admire and would like to copy, or when we dislike some one else and call him mean and selfish.

Now, since we cannot help weighing and judging people, it is of the greatest importance that our weights should be right. The grocer's weights are kept right by a certain standard fixed by the Government. Who can fix the standard of what is right and wrong? Only God. And no one but God can judge anybody quite justly, for He alone knows all their motives and reasons; and how sometimes when they meant good it seemed to turn out wrong. When we weigh actions and people and judge whether they are right or wrong, we must try our weights by the standard; that is, we must consider how God sees them, and we must be very careful, since we cannot see into the heart, lest we should call good what God calls bad, or bad what He calls good. We must have a perfect and just weight, or as near it as we can get, in our ignorance of people's real motives.

<sup>1</sup> R. A. S. Macalister, *A History of Civilization in Palestine*, 44.



The second thing to remember is that we must not have two sets of weights. What is wrong is wrong, whether in ourselves or in others. It is so very easy to see excuses for ourselves. Our faults never seem quite so bad as theirs. We 'did not mean it,' or it was 'only this' or 'only that.' We are apt to weigh their sins with one weight and our own with another. But that will not do. Nor will it do to weigh ourselves with them, and say, 'Well, I am not so bad as that girl anyhow.' God's standard weight is always the same, and the same for everybody. Nor must we have two sets of weights for the people we like, and the people we dislike. You will find in reading the newspapers that people on one side in politics will refuse to believe any wrong of the leaders of their party, while everybody on the opposite side is suspected of all kinds of dishonest motives, and wrong purposes. You will find people belonging to one church who cannot believe in the real goodness of people belonging to any other. That is not right either. Goodness is goodness, and you must admit it wherever you see it, even in those you don't like, and badness is badness in your dearest friend. If you shut your eyes to that, do you know what you are doing? You are spoiling your standard weight.

When weights have been long in use they are apt to get lighter from wear, and they must be tested from time to time. In the same way our standards of right and wrong are apt to get spoiled. They change so gradually that we are not conscious of it, until we suddenly find ourselves doing something which would once have seemed impossible. The boy who steals his master's money would once have been indignant if he had been suspected of it. He began by doing something which was not quite straight, a mere trifle it seemed, and then another and another, each a little further away from the perfect measure, and before he realized it he was a criminal. You know boys and girls who can't 'play the game,' who will cheat at marbles, or start before the signal in a race, or crib a translation, or copy a sum. These are not little things. The boy or girl who is not straight and true even in play is beginning life with a false standard which will grow worse and worse until it will allow them to do anything. You know children who will tell just as much of a story as will give a wrong impression, or who will change the truth a little in the telling. They will soon tell lies, and when they grow up no

one will be able to trust their word or their sincerity. You cannot with safety go even a little bit out of the path of truth and honesty.

Here are two things to remember then—a perfect weight, and only one weight, for yourself as well as everybody else.

Said the boy as he read, 'I too will be bold,  
I will fight for the truth and its glory!'  
He went to the playground, and soon had told  
A very cowardly story!

Said the girl as she read, 'That was grand, I declare!

What a true, what a lovely, sweet soul!'  
In half-an-hour she went up the stair,  
Looking as black as a coal!

'The mean little wretch, I wish I could fling  
This book at his head!' said another;  
Then he went and did the same ugly thing  
To his own little trusting brother!

Alas for him who sees a thing grand  
And does not fit himself to it!  
But the meanest act, on sea or on land,  
Is to find a fault, and then do it!<sup>1</sup>

#### IV.

Eighteen addresses to children by the Rev. Robert Harvie, M.A., have been published by Mr. Allenson under the title of *The King's Uniform* (1s. net). We quote one of them:

'A1.'

'Strength and beauty.'—Ps 96<sup>6</sup>.

We are all interested just now in ships and shipping (besides the ships of our Navy), and one fact about these is instructive.

A large register is kept of all British and foreign ships, and in this book each ship is described in two ways.

The hull (*i.e.* its body or frame) is denoted by a letter. If it is in first-class condition, the letter is A. If it is not so good, some other letter is used.

The other things about a ship—its anchors and cables, its stores and furniture—are denoted by a number. If these are first rate, the number is 1.

<sup>1</sup> G. MacDonald, *Poetical Works*, ii. 181.

If they are inferior, it may be 2, or 3, or another number.

If, therefore, a ship is in the best condition—its hull perfect, and its supplies and fittings in excellent order—the ship is put in Class A1.

Now we have been speaking to-day about Christ. His character was perfect. It was not weakened by sinning, so His strength was the very greatest. His love was also perfect. His devotion to others was the highest. That is His beauty. We may therefore say of Jesus, with all reverence, that He alone, in all the world, is always put in Class A1.

Let me tell you here a story of the war. Two of our soldiers, badly wounded, lay beside a dying German. 'What would I not give for a drink,' said one Briton to the other. The German understood, for our word 'drink' is very like theirs—only they spell it with a 't.' The soldier who told the story said, 'The German kept saying "Here"—pointing to his side.' Our men thought he wanted lifting up, so after a while one of them managed to raise himself and give him a pull. Then he discovered that the man was lying on his water-bottle, and this he held to the dying man's lips. But the German refused it, saying, 'No, not me—I die—you drink.' He did die, and our men gave him a proper burial. They put up a sort of headstone, and they fastened to it a piece of paper on which was written the inscription 'A1.'

'Paper was scarce,' said the soldier, 'but we wanted to put up something.' These were brave men. If they had met a few hours before, they would have matched their strength against each other. But it is good for us to remember incidents like this, which prove that there is another side even to war—a side of it in which brave men of all nations rival each other in sympathy and courtesy and generosity.

Christ teaches us, both by His words and His example, to be brave and strong, though we are to use our strength only for the noblest ends.

He teaches us also to be gentle and kind and thoughtful for others. That is beauty of character. And that noblest strength and perfect beauty we see in Christ Himself, especially in the day of the Cross, when He gave Himself up to die for the sins of the whole world.

The soldiers' inscription over the grave in France means that the German's act was Christ-like. For that he stands, with Christ, in Class A1.

## The Little Dark Church.

Mr. George Hare Leonard, Professor of Modern History in the University of Bristol, has published through the Student Christian Movement (93 Chancery Lane, W.C.) some papers which he read to students of his University last session, under the title of *They Also Serve* (8d. net). They have their motive in the War, but they are not the conventional effort at vindication or of consolation, now both so familiar. There is throughout a sense of things that must be conserved, though it may be hard to hold them in the rending of ties and the sundering of fellowships. But we shall best explain the book by quoting its sketch of the Little Dark Church.

'There is a little dark church in Munich. I do not know its name—perhaps I never knew it. It is not one of the sights of the city; I do not know that it finds any place in the little red books that the tourists carry with them as they go their conscientious rounds. It is in one of the big streets, but I am not sure that it shows any façade at all to the passer-by. You just turn aside out of the sunshine, and in at a door; and, if I remember rightly, down a step or two, and you are in the little, dark, nameless church, out of the noise of the city, out of the glare of the day.

'And there I found myself one August morning, standing awkwardly, as we English Protestants do in foreign churches, and yet feeling the peace and the healing of the little dark sanctuary, hidden away behind the houses and shops of the noisy street outside. But to-day all memories of what it was like—of nave, and aisle, and pillar, and altar, and roof—have disappeared. For me it is the little, unnamed, dark church, where for a moment on that happy, restless holiday there came a pause, and a hush, and an episode—the memory of which stirs and moves me still.

'After all, what is it of which I make so much? Only this—the swinging open of the door, letting in, for a moment, the light of the street; and out of the busy world, following us into the darkness, a boy! Only this—a slip of a lad of fifteen or sixteen in the little dark church, with a tradesman's basket on his arm! But there, in that homely place, he fell on his knees, with his basket on the floor at his side; and there, in the remembered presence of God—I felt that!—he said his



prayers! I thought of the errand boys I knew in England—well, we have other ways here, I know—and then I thought of myself, as I stood there in the shadow, and I knew, suddenly, that the little dark church was indeed the house of God, the gate of heaven.

‘In the old Pinacothek, in the little room where the early Flemish pictures hang, my heart had stretched back through the centuries to the old painter, with his love for the little ferns, and the flowers in the crannied wall, and the humblest of God’s creatures, that “stilly seizeth on the herb appointed for her food”; and now, in the little dark church, the barriers of country and religion and class, and all the pitiful things that keep men apart, were swept away, and I knew that our spirits touched—his and mine. “Behold, a ladder set up on the earth, and the top of it reached to heaven,” and we two waited together by the lowest of the stairs!’

‘They were not long prayers that he said. Soon he rose from his knees and was gone, with his basket on his arm, swinging open the door that let in the light from the sunny street, and in a moment I, too, was once more out of the little dark church, moving along the busy ways, amongst all the wonderful sights and sounds of Munich on that sunny summer day. I never saw him again; I shall never see him again. I do not know his name, I cannot even remember what he was like—indeed, I hardly saw his face—but there before me still is the kneeling figure of a working lad lost in prayer, with the tradesman’s basket by his side—a vision of a German boy in a little humble church, far away, waiting in the darkness and the stillness upon God!’

‘That is all my story, or that would be all my story, only to-day, with the world at war, I ask myself what has become of that boy whom I saw so many years ago in Munich at his prayers in the little dark church. Long since he became a man, I suppose, and now, if he lives, he must be fighting, I imagine, in one of the armies of the enemy, and it is our business, if we can, to shoot him down.

‘That is the tragedy of war. And as I think of him, I think, too, of the forty thousand German students in the trenches all bidden, as some of you have been reading, to be humble-minded and “to free themselves from hatred.” Perhaps you remember the very phrases about “splendid William Booth,” and Florence Nightingale, “the

saint, with her conquering love of humanity,” which sprang from the “highest English womanly kultur”; and Arnold Toynbee, Ruskin and Carlyle, “souls in whom the greatness and goodness of England were incorporate.” You remember how these students were urged to think of the beaten foe in France, of “souls and families cast down”; bidden to put themselves “in the place of these people in whose country is the enemy, who have suffered, and been sacrificed,” as they think, “in vain.”

‘We have heard so much of the flood of hate that it is well for us to remember that there is another current running amongst the men at the front who come from the universities of Germany. “It may be our duty to fight, it is never our duty to hate.” “Hatred disorganizes, love disciplines.” “Purification from hate is often easier on the field than at home;” but that there must be this purification, those who write for the students are clear. These are the messages sent to the trenches; and while men there are taught to recall “the better England,” the great nation with its “noble traditions” that can never die, our thoughts stretch forth—not without love even now—to the better Germany we have known—and know.

‘For some of these students were our own familiar friends. “We took sweet counsel together, and walked into the house of God in company.” Between us a cloud has come—grave “misunderstandings,” and in these late days of ordered outrage the division has gone deep indeed. But it is for us to remember always that the students and the general mass of men in Germany do not know—sometimes we wonder whether they will ever know—how they have been led astray and deceived by the leaders in whom they put so blind a trust, and whom they have been schooled so methodically to obey.

‘These men, so near to us, give their lives willingly for Germany, as we give ours for England, and if we fight well—we English and Germans—as in this strange tangle in which we are involved, we believe we must—love, as we have learnt it in the school of Christ, may falter, but can never fail. “Let death seize upon them!”—so the old savage words stand in the primitive psalm—but the curse that follows is wholly alien to our minds as we think of the awful duty that is ours. We shoot them down if we can, because, as we believe, there is no other way. And they—these students, whose

hearts we know, whose aspirations and whose highest hopes are the same as ours—shoot us down, taught “to kill from love of country, not from hatred of the foe.”

“Taught to *kill*!” I get the words down—not easily—but I want them for myself in black and white. I must see clearly what it all means—this “killing” and this “shooting down.” I cannot play with words and phrases now . . . this butchery! . . . this killing and this shooting down! I must get for myself this vision of the “great Ocean of Darkness and Death.”

‘Words come back to me to-day, words used by one of our poets here when he was left face to face with the *ordinary* mysteries of life and death—the passionate cry of a disquieted soul:

“If this is as it ought to be,  
My God, I leave it unto Thee!”

It is said, I know, by some thinkers at home and abroad that this welter of blood and death does indeed belong to the scheme of the universe. “God will see to it,” said Treitschke, “that war always recurs as a drastic medicine for the human race.” God will see to it that from time to time men go out to kill and shoot one another down! . . . I cannot recognize their God. I believe in the Father of all men, and in the “Ocean of Light and Love,” which is greater than the Ocean of Darkness and Death, and looking into the darkness I grow at last content to leave it all with One in whom is no darkness at all.

‘But God, in His turn, leaves it again with us. It is for us, if we know His will, to work out the salvation of the world, so labouring—and so living—that the nations shall not learn war any more.

‘Meanwhile, let us remember, there are worse things than blood and death. For us still, I believe, though the tide may run low, it is a spiritual struggle; and the life of the body is as nothing to the life of the soul. In the fine letter M. Sabatier wrote to the President of the International Society of Franciscan Studies at Assisi, he finds his country (*la France actuelle*) fulfilling her ideal and her destiny. War now is her *vocation*. “Et si elle doit mourir à la tâche, qu’importe, si elle a fait *son œuvre*?” And many in England

have heard the call, and if they die, can it matter so much if their work is done?

‘Our enemies, too, have their ideals, ideals—some of them—deadly, we believe, to the interests of all the world; but for the mass of men in Germany, mistaught, misled, and daily misinformed, it is a war in which they are ready to lay down their lives for the dear love of the Fatherland, which inspires them every one, and many certainly believe in a “world-mission” which we ought at least to try to *understand*. “Could we pray for victory,” they ask, “if it would bring ruin to other nations? . . . We give our lives for Germany in the certainty that the day of victory will be the day of salvation for humanity.” “A world-war at the time of a world-mission will leave behind a *world-task*. It is possible for a nation to be ruined by success. Our future and our effect on the world depend on the spirit in which you return, and on what we have become meanwhile in God’s school.” These are the words of hope and warning—read over and over again, we must believe, by many in the trenches who contend for a high if wholly mistaken ideal.

‘The men of the German universities, like ourselves, are in “God’s school.” We must fight as things are—let us see it clearly!—and shoot one another down; but I believe we students of the old friendship in some deep sense will understand one another through all the misunderstanding because of the things we have seen and heard together, and our hands have handled of the word of life; and putting away all wrath, and malice, and evil-speaking, fight, if it must be, and work, and *wait*, for the peace and healing of the new day that is, by God’s grace, to dawn not only on a new Germany, but on a new England, a new France, a new Europe, and a new world.

‘Thinking of the German students I have known here in England in the old days, when we came very near to one another, I have wandered in thought far away from the little dark church. But once again I see the doors swing open, and out of the sunny streets comes a boy with a tradesman’s basket on his arm. And once again I join him in his prayers.’



# The Sacrament of Baptism in the New Testament.

BY THE REV. BERKELEY G. COLLINS, A.T.S., BLUNTISHAM.

## II.

### IV. THE FULFILMENT OF THE PROMISE.

'THERE is nothing in Christianity more primitive than the sacraments,' says Dr. Denney, 'and the sacraments, wherever they exist, are witnesses to the connexion between the death of Christ and the forgiveness of sins.'<sup>1</sup> And it is with the forgiveness of sins and the gift of the Spirit that Christian baptism is associated from the beginning. 'Repent ye, and be baptized every one of you in the Name of Jesus Christ unto the remission of your sins; and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit' (Ac 2<sup>38</sup>). The words 'unto the remission of sins' recall the preaching of John and his baptism. But the reference to the 'Name of Jesus Christ' implies something more than was contained in the earlier rite. Although it is implicit rather than explicit, there can be no doubt that an actual forgiveness, on the ground of the death and resurrection of Christ, was offered in these words. This is the first distinction between John's baptism and Christian baptism. John's baptism was associated with a forgiveness to be received, or, at least, to be effective, when the Kingdom of God arrived. Christian baptism was associated with a forgiveness already available because the Messiah had come and, in principle, had initiated the new order, of which fact the gift of the Spirit was the proof. But, as we have seen was the case in John's baptism, the association between the rite and forgiveness was more than formal. It may be too much to say, with Dr. Plummer, that baptism 'conferred'<sup>2</sup> forgiveness, but that it was most intimately related to forgiveness is clear. It is not an exaggeration to say that the primitive Church did not conceive of forgiveness apart from baptism. Forgiveness was through the Name of Jesus Christ, and it was baptism which initiated a believer into the power and efficacy of the Name. This is evident from such a passage as Ac 10<sup>48</sup> taken in connexion with v.<sup>48</sup>, 'To him bear all the prophets witness that through his name, every one that believeth on him shall receive remission of sins. . . . And he commanded them to be

baptized in the name of Jesus Christ.' A still clearer instance of the association of baptism with forgiveness is to be found in the words of Ananias to Paul, 'Arise and be baptized, and wash away thy sins, calling on his name' (22<sup>16</sup>). There is a straight path from these words to the sacramentarianism of the sub-apostolic Church. Neither Barnabas nor Hermas has put the matter more simply. Baptism made the forgiveness an actuality. It 'washed away' the sins of the past. Other New Testament passages are of the same tenor. 'Such were some of you,' writes Paul to the Corinthians, 'but ye were washed, but ye were sanctified,' etc. (1 Co 6<sup>11</sup>), and to the Ephesians he writes 'Christ also loved the Church, and gave himself for it, that he might sanctify it, having cleansed it by the washing of water with the word' (Eph 5<sup>25, 26</sup>). Similarly the writer of Hebrews says, 'Let us draw near with a true heart in fulness of faith, having our hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience, and our body washed with pure water' (10<sup>22</sup>). In thus connecting baptism with the remission of sins the early Church was continuing the tradition of John the Baptist, except that it put into the rite its own gospel message.

But in the Acts of the Apostles, at least, it is not the connexion of baptism with the forgiveness of sins which is emphasized so much as its connexion with the Spirit. And here we have to deal with the most important fact that the Spirit is conceived in almost an animistic fashion. Its manifestations were physical. They could be discerned by the senses. It was in strange 'tongues,' and abnormal ecstasies, that Christians saw the chief evidence of the divine presence and power. These phenomena do not impress us as 'spiritual.' A modern historian would give a very different account of them from that which we possess in the New Testament. There was nothing ethical about them. They might, on occasion, even be divorced from faith in Christ (cp. 1 Co 12<sup>3</sup>). They were the result of profound emotional disturbances. A sympathetic writer would say with Beyschlag, 'It is easy to conceive that the solemn hour of baptism, in which a profession of repentance and faith formed the crucial feature, was, as a rule, a climax of the

<sup>1</sup> *Death of Christ*, 84.

<sup>2</sup> Hastings' *D.B.*, article 'Baptism.'

inner life, and that the new enthusiasm of that life appeared then in these prophetic manifestations which had become the common possession of Christianity.<sup>1</sup> But it is scarcely possible to dissociate them not only from the crude animism of earlier 'prophecy' (1 S 10<sup>23</sup> *et al.*), but from similar phenomena in the heathen cults. The early believers, however, regarded them as the immediate effects of the outpouring of the Spirit. They were the fulfilment, or the partial fulfilment, of the promise of John. And it is very significant that it was in them, and not primarily in the moral results of faith, that they recognized this fulfilment. *They were evidences that the divine power was already at work and that the kingdom was indeed at hand.* The 'powers of the age to come' were visibly present. The dawn was in the sky even if the sun was not above the horizon. The Apocalyptic character of these phenomena is abundantly clear from Peter's address on their first appearance. He connects them with one of the most eschatological passages in the Old Testament. 'This is that which hath been spoken by the prophet Joel. . . . I will pour out my Spirit, and they shall prophesy. And I will show wonders in the heaven above, and signs on the earth beneath . . . before the day of the Lord come, that great and notable day' (Ac 2<sup>16ff.</sup>). It is only when taken in connexion with the Apocalyptic hope that the stress laid on these manifestations can be understood. They were believed to be wrought by that same supernatural energy which would create the new heavens and earth, and transform the mortal into the immortal. The possession by the Spirit meant that this divine power was already entering the bodies and souls of believers. And it was in baptism that it was received.

#### V. PAUL AND THE SACRAMENTS.

There can be no question about the sacramentarianism of the Apostle Paul. It is now frankly recognized by scholars of all schools. 'I have rendered the word *pneumatikon* (πνευματικόν) here "supernatural" rather than "spiritual,"' writes Dr. Denney on 1 Co 10<sup>1-4</sup>, 'because it suggests better the element of mystery, or rather of divineness, which all through this passage is connected with the Sacraments. Baptism is not a common washing, nor is the Supper common meat and drink; it is a divine cleansing, a divine nourishment, with

<sup>1</sup> *Th. N.T.* i. 320.

which we have to do in these rites; there is a mysterious power of God in them . . .'<sup>2</sup> So also Wrede, in his most brilliant but inadequate essay, says, 'His ideas of the sacred acts of baptism and the Lord's Supper, which moreover are not of his creation, were in no wise purely spiritual or symbolic. He certainly can and does find symbols in them, but it is equally certain that they are to him in their own nature real sacraments, that is, acts which are intrinsically operative, without the sensibilities and sentiments of the person coming into account.'<sup>3</sup> The justice of these remarks will appear on a study of the passage referred to above, together with chap. 11<sup>27ff.</sup> (especially v.<sup>30</sup>). In the former Paul is dealing with the exaggerated dependence of the Corinthians on the sacraments, and his argument is that the fathers had similar privileges and yet fell in the wilderness. They had supernatural meat and drink even as the Corinthians had in the Supper; nevertheless, baptized though they were into Moses, and fed by manna, many perished through sin. In the latter passage, he attributes the sickness that prevailed in the community, and even the death of some, to an unworthy partaking of the sacred Bread. It is easy to see that he is concerned about the moral life of his converts and is anxious that they should not think of the sacraments as mere charms. But it is equally clear that he shared their belief as to the supernatural character of the sacraments. Findlay's comment on the last passage, 'the mere coincidence of such afflictions with the desecration of the Eucharist could not have justified Paul in making this statement; he must have been conscious of some special revelation to this effect,'<sup>4</sup> is simply an attempt to blanch the obvious meaning out of it. There is no hint of a special revelation. The inference that the sickness and death were due to the abuse of the sacrament follows from the supernatural character attributed to it. And it has a bearing not only on the nature of the particular benefit supposed to be conveyed in the Supper, but on the baptismal gift also. For the Supper simply renews and strengthens that which was received in baptism.

Paul's teaching on baptism finds expression incidentally in the course of his great argument in the Epistle to the Romans, and in connexion with his doctrine of the 'mystical union' of the believer

<sup>2</sup> *Death of Christ*, 134 n.

<sup>3</sup> *Paul*, 120.

<sup>4</sup> *Expos. Gk. Test.*, in loc.



with Christ. To Paul, as to the whole primitive Church, the most vital and central fact of the new age initiated by the Resurrection of Jesus Christ was the common possession of the Spirit. The earliest circle had regarded it as the special endowment which the Lord had received at His baptism, and which had equipped Him for His Messianic vocation. It was this Spirit which the Risen Christ 'poured out' upon His followers. But reflexion led to a closer association of the Spirit with the Person of Christ than this, and one of the most fruitful doctrinal achievements of Paul was the identification of the Spirit with the living and reigning Christ.<sup>1</sup> He was not only 'declared' to be the Son of God by the Resurrection, He became by the Resurrection the 'life-giving Spirit' (1 Co 15<sup>45</sup>). Once Paul said most directly, 'The Lord is the Spirit' (2 Co 3<sup>17</sup>). In Ro 8, 'the Spirit of God' and 'the Spirit of Christ' are synonymous terms. This identification of the Spirit with Christ led Paul to the emphasis on the ethical side of the Christian life which characterized his teaching. Not that he did not believe, with others, that the 'gift of tongues,' 'miracles,' and other 'hyper-physical' manifestations were the results of the Spirit, but he prized above these, as being more essentially divine, 'love, joy, peace, long-suffering, kindness, beneficence, fidelity, meekness, and self-control . . .' In common with the primitive Jewish Church, he associated the Spirit with baptism. That association was among the things he 'received.' He did not originate it, he accepted it as part of the common faith. But he enriched it by his identification of the Spirit with Christ. In baptism the believer, according to his doctrine, did not so much receive the 'gift of the Spirit' as become united to the Lord. This union, he conceives, is an absolute union. The believer becomes incorporate with Christ in such wise that he is, as it were, one person with Him. What has happened to the Lord has also happened to the Christian. The believer has been crucified with Christ, has been buried with Him, has risen with Him. So actual is the identification and incorporation of the believer with Christ, that he 'no longer lives' but Christ lives 'in him.' This is the result of Paul's equating the Spirit with the Lord. Baptism, therefore, as the medium through which the Spirit is communicated, is much more than a symbol of death and resurrection. In baptism the believer

<sup>1</sup> Moffatt, *Paulinism*, 36 ff.

actually enters into the death and resurrection.<sup>2</sup> He dies with Christ, and rises with Him. The language and argument of Ro 6 require an absolute identification of the baptized person with Christ: As in His death Christ died unto sin, so in baptism the believer dies unto sin. As Christ by His resurrection entered upon the heavenly life, so the believer enters upon the same Life on rising from the water. In the sixth chapter Paul insists upon the reality of this baptismal death in reference to sin; in the seventh, in reference to the Law. As death clears men of all claims, so neither sin nor the Law has any claim upon the baptized. He is dead and therefore free from both. On the other hand, the baptized person as risen from the dead shares the Life of the Risen Christ over whom neither sin *nor* death has any power. The indwelling Spirit of Christ is the Spirit of righteousness, but it is also the Spirit of immortality. It is a quickening Spirit which quickens the mortal body. Not only ethically, but physically, the believer is one with the Risen Christ. Not figuratively, but actually, he shares His resurrection life. The 'redemption of the body' is as much part of the Spirit's work as the redemption of the soul. And Paul makes it clear that this redemption is part of a universal quickening and redemption of creation. The immortalized believer will live in a new heaven and earth, which will be the old transfigured and redeemed, 'delivered from the bondage of corruption.' We are obviously here in the world of Apocalyptic; and, however deepened and heightened, essentially this doctrine of a hyper-physical operation of the Spirit, embracing the body as well as the soul, is the same as that received in the most primitive circles. Paul's exposition of this redemptive work of the Spirit throws light on the strange practice of the Corinthians of baptizing for the dead. This can only mean a vicarious baptism. It was evidently believed that it was efficacious in securing for the dead a share in the resurrection. And while we have no right to assume that Paul countenanced it, it is at least significant that he could use it as an argument for the resurrection without condemning it. In truth, it is an example of the extravagant value the Corinthians were disposed to place on the sacraments. It is an illegitimate extension of a doctrine they received from Paul himself, namely,

<sup>2</sup> See Denney on 'Rom.' *in loc.*, *Expos. Gk. Test.*; De Bosc, *Gospel acc. to St. Paul*, 180; Wrede, *Paul*, 121.

that the Spirit given in baptism was the Spirit of the new life, not ethical only but physical. It was the principle of Christ's own Resurrection life.<sup>1</sup>

Strictly speaking, Paul's doctrine requires a present immortality as well as a present immunity from sin. The baptized believer has literally left behind him the whole of the present order which is subject to sin and death. And it is because this is evidently not actually true that his words are usually strained to yield only a mystical or ethical sense. But Paul himself has no apparent difficulty in the matter. He can in the same breath affirm that the body is dead, and urge believers to resist sin, that the redemption is perfect since we have risen with Christ, and yet confess that we are awaiting the redemption of the body. The explanation is to be found in the distinction between the accomplished fact and the outward realization of it. It is true we are dead with Christ and risen with Him, but this cannot be fully realized until the end of the world—which, of course, to Paul was close at hand. It is for this reason that 'the whole Pauline conception of salvation is characterized by suspense; a suspense which strains forwards towards the final release, the actual death. The earthly life is not the setting in which salvation becomes complete.'<sup>2</sup> But so close is the End to the Beginning that Paul can speak of that as actually perfect which in fact is yet to be fully realized. And this is probably the reason why his thought of the future of the body seems to waver between the transformation of the present body and a resurrection in a 'spiritual body'; and between a 'spiritual' body which is forming now within the mortal, and a body 'reserved in heaven.'

There is another point to notice. In common with others Paul associated the Spirit, or in his case Christ, with baptism. And yet there are strong reasons for thinking that he did so, not because his doctrine required this, but because it was part of the common tradition. He himself appears to have thought little of the external act of baptism, seeing that he could found a Church at Corinth and himself perform the rite only in the case of one or two persons. 'He preaches sacra-

ments, but does not feel himself to be a mystagogue; rather, he retains the simplicity in regard to forms of worship which belongs to the Jewish spirit.'<sup>3</sup> And in truth there is no necessary connexion between Paul's doctrine of salvation and any sacrament. This is clear whether we have regard to his doctrine of justification by faith or to his doctrine of the Spirit. It is faith, not baptism, which appropriates Christ; and it is faith, not baptism, which justifies. And in estimating Paul's teaching on baptism it must never be forgotten that he is thinking of the baptism of believers who are baptized because they have apprehended Christ by faith and are reconciled to God by that fact. Apart from faith Paul would have seen no meaning whatever in baptism. In the same way his doctrine of the Spirit as the energy of a new moral life, producing as its chief fruits not 'tongues' and such phenomena, but ethical changes, cannot be associated with a mechanical reception of the Spirit. It also is received by faith, 'by the hearing of faith' as Paul expresses it (Gal 3<sup>2</sup>). Baptism, in short, is too small for what Paul puts into it. And his own attitude to the rite suggests that he was aware of it. The least that can be said on this subject is that the fact that baptism was administered only to believers made it possible for him to use the language he did about it; and if—though this is doubtful—he was unconscious of any inconsistency, it is for the same reason that he did not realize the greater contradiction between the predestinarianism he inherited from his Pharisaic antecedents, and the universal sweep of the reconciling work of Christ which was the resonant note of his gospel. The human mind can hold at one and the same time mutually exclusive conceptions of religion. Augustine and Luther, Paul's greatest interpreters, exhibit in different ways this same peculiarity. The 'Confessions' with its intense and solitary experiences of the immediacy of God, does not belong to the same world as the Augustinian doctrine of the absolute authority of the Church; and it is very hard to reconcile the 'Commentary on Galatians' with Luther's 'obstinate' adhesion to a high sacramental doctrine of the Eucharist.<sup>4</sup> To Paul's own writings must be applied the liberating principle he himself so effectively championed, 'the letter killeth, but the spirit giveth life.'

<sup>1</sup> Cp. Ignatius' name for the Eucharist, 'the medicine of immortality'; and see *ad Smyrn.* 7, 'They abstain from the Eucharist . . . and, for this cause, contradicting the gift of God, they die in their disputes. But much better would it be for them to receive it, that they might one day rise through it.'

<sup>2</sup> Wrede, *Paul*, 103.

<sup>3</sup> Schweitzer, *Paul and his Interpreters*, 213.

<sup>4</sup> Harnack, *Hist. Dogma*, v. 78, vii. 259.



## Literature.

### MR. BALFOUR'S GIFFORD LECTURES.

THE Gifford Lectures for 1914 at the University of Glasgow were delivered by the Right Hon. Arthur James Balfour, LL.D., D.C.L. They were spoken, not read; so that after their delivery they had to be written out, since one of the conditions laid down by Lord Gifford is that the lectures must be published. In spite of distractions, the distraction first of an impending and then of an actually and awfully existent war, Mr. Balfour has been able to write them out. They are published by Messrs. Hodder & Stoughton under the title of *Theism and Humanism* (10s. 6d. net).

Though written out, they are spoken lectures still. Some men can speak who cannot write, and some can write who cannot speak. Some men can both speak and write, but their speaking is one thing and their writing another. Mr. Balfour is a speaker. The surprise and charm of his writing is that it is speech, with all the inflexions of the living voice. Read his Giffords first by yourself and in silence; then read them aloud to another, and the discovery will be made.

Here is an example to experiment upon. Near the middle of the book Mr. Balfour gives us 'an autobiographical parenthesis.' It is his attitude in Cambridge 'in the middle sixties' to the claims put forth on behalf of John Stuart Mill's philosophy. Of Mill's admirers he takes Leslie Stephen as typical. Leslie Stephen 'holds, with unshaken confidence, that nothing deserves to be believed but that which in the last resort is proved by "experience"; that the strength of our beliefs should be exactly proportioned to the evidence which "experience" can supply, and that every one knows or can discover exactly what this evidence amounts to. Leslie Stephen refers to a well-known aphorism of Locke, who declared that "there is one unerring mark by which a man may know whether he is a lover of truth in earnest, viz. the not entertaining any proposition with greater assurance than the proofs it is built on will warrant." Upon which Leslie Stephen observes that the sentiment is a platitude, but, in view of the weakness of human nature, a useful platitude. Is it a platitude? Did Locke act up to it? Did Hume act up to it, or any other of Leslie Stephen's

philosophic progenitors? Does anybody act up to it? Does anybody sincerely try to act up to it?'

Read that passage both ways, first silently, then, aloud, and see if it is not so. This is a great speaker writing, and losing not a tone of the voice, scarcely a movement of the hand, in the process. And yet Mr. Balfour tells us that he has always found literary composition laborious and slow, from which we gather that the lectures were written out with his own hand in the solitude of the study.

The charm, then, which is notoriously Mr. Balfour's as a speaker, is the most arresting feature of his new book. There are clean-cut sentences which from other men would have claimed much rewriting, but here take their finished expression at once from the intellect of the speaker in emotional play with his audience. Such sentences as these: 'Few persons are prevented from thinking themselves right by the reflection that, if they be right, the rest of the world is wrong.' 'Change is never more than a redistribution of that which never changes.' 'Scratch an argument, and you find a cause.' And as are such sentences, so is the book.

It is deliberately and avowedly addressed to the 'plain man,' as he crowded the Bute Hall day after day. It assures him that the convictions upon which he builds his character and lives his daily life, convictions of the reality of a God who knows and cares and does things, are more reliable than the supposition, whatever name it bears, that the universe has nothing but matter with which to form its combinations of beauty and worth, and forms them therefore fortuitously. Mr. Balfour never proves the existence and enterprise of God. He still believes and still says that proof, such as the student of physical science demands, is not available. For all that, he is by no means content with a peradventure. We have the negative evidence of the breakdown of all other explanations of the universe but the theistic; we have the positive evidence of 'design,' not perhaps in nature, but in the moral life; and, above all, we have the overwhelming evidence of history and our own human heart. It is enough to satisfy us. Only a God who does things, and does them with a conscious purpose, is able in the first place to bring

life and consciousness into being, and in the second place to make sacrifice or any form of self-denial a reality and redeem it from ghastly futility.

### THE RENAISSANCE.

While the book season in this country is more promising than for a time seemed likely or even possible, in America there is quite an unusual publishing activity. What does it mean? That America is making money? It means more than that. It means that the mind of America is being stirred to unusual range and depth, and books are demanded, especially religious and historical books, to satisfy the desire for fuller knowledge and firmer faith.

Among the American books which have been republished in this country is one with a long title written by Edward Maslin Hulme, Professor of History in the University of Idaho. Its title is *The Renaissance, the Protestant Revolution, and the Catholic Reformation in Continental Europe* (Allen & Unwin; 10s. net).

Without a word of preface or introduction, we are precipitated into the history of the Renaissance and a volume of nearly six hundred closely printed pages. But we are at home immediately. For Professor Hulme takes no knowledge on our part for granted. He writes the most transparent English without the least effort, and he makes everything clear as he proceeds. His business is simply to write history, not to discuss questions, whether political or religious, and he writes it for the uninstructed. At first the style suggests the desk of the lecturer; but that impression passes. The author has written his book to be read, but he has kept ever before his mind a definite class of readers. It is perhaps a pity, considering the readers he writes for, that he did not issue the work in three volumes, according to the three subjects named in the title. Here, however, we have the history of the three great movements in one handsome if somewhat ponderous volume; and there is nothing to hinder any reader from going right through it, so easy is the narrative and so inoffensive.

So inoffensive is it that one can scarcely tell whether Professor Hulme is a Protestant or a Roman Catholic. He does justice to Luther and he is considerate of Tetzels. To Calvin alone is he

less kind than might have been expected of him. But it takes a Calvinist to appreciate Calvin, and Dr. Hulme is not a Calvinist.

As an example of the clearness of his descriptive narrative, let us quote his account of an indulgence:

'What is an indulgence? Every sin, so the Catholic Church holds, entails two consequences—guilt and punishment. Guilt is the stain upon the soul. It can be removed only by genuine contrition, the act of confession, and a sincere purpose to amend his ways in the future, on the part of the sinner, and by the absolution given by the priest in the sacrament of confession. After the guilt has thus been removed the punishment still remains. Punishment may be undergone by the penitent either in this world or in purgatory. Only when every stain, all guilt, is washed away from the soul, and all the punishment that has been incurred has been fulfilled, is it possible to enter the kingdom of heaven. When Christ underwent the sacrifice of the cross more merit resulted than was necessary to save those who had lived upon earth up to that time. This superabundant merit was increased by that which resulted from the life of Mary, the mother of Christ, and it is still further and constantly augmented by those saints whose lives have been such as to enable them to earn merit more than sufficient for their own salvation. This store of supererogatory merit is in the keeping of the Church. It can be dispensed, by means of indulgences, at the discretion of Christ's vicar upon earth, the Pope. There are two kinds of indulgences, partial and plenary. A partial indulgence is a remission of a part of the penance incurred up to that time by the penitent sinner; and a plenary indulgence is a remission of all the punishment that has thus far been incurred by the contrite offender. Indulgences were granted for prayers, pilgrimages, and other good works, and, later on, for money. Such is the theory of indulgences, a theory which as yet has not been authoritatively defined by the Church.'

### THE LITERARY MAN'S NEW TESTAMENT.

A good and pleasant thing it is to see a purely literary man taking to the study of the Bible. Dr. W. L. Courtney has had encouragement to prepare *The Literary Man's New Testament*



(Chapman & Hall; 10s. 6d. net) that we may place it beside his Old Testament volume.

It is edited in the same way. The felicitous (but not absolutely accurate) Preface (for Mr. F. C. Conybeare does not 'expound,' he *explodes* the Christ-Myth theory) is followed by an interesting list of literature. Then come six essays to serve the literary man for what is called in the great commentaries 'Introduction.' These essays deal with the New Testament and Modern Criticism; the Language of the New Testament; Growth of a Creed; The Messiah of Eschatology; The Gospel according to Paul; Paul the Hellenist. After the essays we have the text. It is the Authorized Version arranged in paragraphs, the verses being noted in the margin, as in the Revised Version. The book closes with an Index.

The essays that make up the Introduction are admirably expressed. The author's meaning is never in doubt; his ear for the rhythm of prose is never at fault. They do not show signs of wide reading; but the reading has been well chosen; the books used are modern and scholarly. Much knowledge is no doubt imparted to the literary man, and in the most attractive and appetizing form; the theologian is deliberately disregarded.

It is altogether an interesting book. No doubt it would take a clumsier artist than Dr. W. L. Courtney to make the New Testament uninteresting. But it would be interesting even if it were not the New Testament. Almost any good ancient author treated in this way would attract us. The only criticism that there is room for is this: Why does Dr. Courtney arrange the books of the New Testament in chronological order? It has been done before, we know, but successfully only when done for study, not for reading. The Epistles are placed before the Gospels. Dr. Courtney gives his reasons, but they are not good enough. For the Gospels must be read before the Epistles; the Epistles are not intelligible if they are read first. It is true that the Epistles were for the most part written first. But they were written by men who were steeped in the facts and thoughts contained in the Gospels, men who could not have been what they were but for the Gospels, far less written an Epistle. The compilers of the Canon placed the Gospels first, for they worked on behalf of the general reader. We still believe that they had good guidance in doing so.

### THE ENGLISH RITE.

By the issue of his volume on the Eastern Liturgies, Dr. F. E. Brightman took his place among the few really learned liturgiologists in the world. It is nineteen years since that volume appeared. The delay in the issue of the companion volume on the Western Liturgies was understood to be due to ill health. But now we see that there was another reason. Dr. Brightman has been tempted to turn aside, in order to prepare and publish a Synopsis of the Sources and Revisions of the Book of Common Prayer. That book is now in our hands. Its title is *The English Rite* (Rivingtons; 2 vols. 8vo, pp. ccxxx + 1068, 42s. net).

We say he has been tempted to turn aside from the preparation of his Western Liturgies, so greatly longed for, in order to issue this book. It may be, however, that he found it necessary to prepare this book in order to have the materials for the Western Liturgies in his hands in a complete and reliable form. It is true that this is not the first time that a comparison has been made between the various editions of the Prayer Book. In particular, there is Pickering's handsome and costly issue of the editions in separate folio volumes, and there is the convenient and inexpensive volume by Keeling, entitled *Liturgiae Britannicae*, which was also published by Pickering. But neither of those books fulfilled Dr. Brightman's ideal or fitted his purpose. One is too unwieldy, the other covers only part of the ground; and both omit the original sources, the most necessary and the most difficult part of Dr. Brightman's book.

There are four columns, occupying two pages at a time. The first column indicates the sources. These may be Latin and original (which are printed in full, in two sizes of what is called Dryden type); or they may be mediate, being taken from some of the great 'Uses,' when they are indicated by Gothic letters, E for Exeter, M for Mozarabic, Q for Quinones, R for Roman, S for Sarum, W for Westminster, and Y for York. Again, the sources may be German: they are then printed in Clarendon type. Thus we can see at a glance where the particular passage came from originally and through what intermediate channel it passed into the Book of Common Prayer. The other three columns contain the editions of 1549, 1552, and 1661, with their differences so marked in the printing that they cannot easily be missed.

This is a great service to have been rendered by one man to the study of liturgy. But this is not all the service which has been rendered by Dr. Brightman. Nor is it the most peculiar service. This service could have been rendered by any man who had the necessary conscientiousness and painstaking perseverance. But there are few if any who could have written the Introduction. Although it occupies 230 pages it is a marvel of condensed scholarship. It contains a history of the making of the Book of Common Prayer, from the earliest Diffusion and Development of the Roman Rite to the last Revision. Not only every chapter but every section of a chapter has its literature appended; and that literature, so unerringly selected and described, gives us some idea of the reading that had to be done and the judgments that had to be formed before this book could even be begun.

We say judgments had to be formed, and these were not always purely liturgical. To close this notice of a great book, a book sure enough to become one of the classics of the growing science of Liturgics, we may quote the judgment which Dr. Brightman gives of the circumstances under which was produced the Scottish Book of Common Prayer of 1637. 'In Scotland the Book of 1552 was in partial use from 1557 onwards; but after the reformation of 1560 it was gradually replaced by the *Book of Common Order*, which was substantially identical with the book—itsself largely identical with Calvin's *La forme des prières*—compiled by Knox and his fellows at Geneva, and was authorized by the General Assembly in 1564. After the restoration of a real episcopate in 1610, in place of the "tulchan" bishops instituted in 1572, projects for a new service-book began to be formed, and in 1616 the General Assembly assented to the adoption of a fixed uniform rite. But, except that "The forme and maner of ordaining ministers: and consecrating of arch-bishops and bishops used in the Church of Scotland," founded on the English Ordinal, but ignoring the diaconate, was printed in 1620, no definite result was reached till 1629, when the Scottish bishops negotiated with the King, and in consequence Charles desired Wm. Laud, bishop of London (1628–1633), to communicate with the bishops on the matter. Laud recommended the adoption of the English book, and induced the King to take the same view. But after some delay, in 1633 Charles yielded to the desire of the Scottish bishops for a service-book of their own, and directed

a committee of bishops to prepare it, following the English book "as near as can be," and to submit it to the censure of Laud, now archbishop of Canterbury (1633–1645), Wm. Juxon, bishop of London (1633–1660), and Matthew Wren, dean of Windsor (1628–1634). The work was carried out in the main by the bishops, John Maxwell of Ross and James Wedderburn of Dunblane. Laud had been reluctant to co-operate, but having consented he gave them "the best help he could," and the King interested himself in the details of their work. *The Booke of Common Prayer, and Administration of the Sacraments; And Other Parts of Divine Service for the Use of the Church of Scotland* was published early in 1637. Unhappily it rested only on the authority of the Crown and the bishops, without reference to the General Assembly or anybody else, and was enjoined by a royal proclamation dated 20th December 1636 and prefixed to the book. The results, as is well known, were disastrous.'

#### RELIGIOUS SOCIOLOGY.

*The Elementary Forms of the Religious Life* is the title of a book by Professor Émile Durkheim of the University of Paris, which has been translated into English by Mr. Joseph Ward Swain, M.A. (Allen & Unwin; 15s. net). It is further described as 'A Study in Religious Sociology.'

The book is a manual of Primitive Religion. But it is correctly called 'A Study in Sociology.' For the origin and development of religion, and all its rites, ceremonies, and beliefs, are traced, not to the need of the individual, but to the demands of the community. In short, Professor Durkheim does for religion what Professor Westermarck does for morality—he finds its explanation in the fact that man is a gregarious animal. No crowd, then no morality and no religion.

This position will be challenged. 'My soul longeth, yea, even fainteth for the courts of the Lord: my heart and my flesh crieth out for the living God.' That is the desire of the individual, and that desire is echoed in innumerable individual hearts all the world over. To which Professor Durkheim would reply, that in a highly developed religion like that of the Israelites, the individual is strong enough to stand by himself; but his heart's cry is really the prayer of the community which he has for the moment appropriated to himself. It is a cry for protection or prosperity (in war



perhaps) first of all. And but for the need of the community the individual would not even know that he had a God to cry to.

Dr. Durkheim gathers his data mainly from the least civilized tribes of the earth. But he does not neglect altogether the higher forms of religion. The truth is that his way from lower to higher is very easy. The outward rites differ. They differ so greatly as often to make us shudder at the horrors perpetrated by the uncivilized in the name of religion. But the ideas underlying the rites and aimed at in them do not differ. And when Dr. Durkheim discusses such a fact as asceticism, he finds that with all outward incongruities there is an underlying likeness.

And that likeness is sociological. Surely, we say, the monk goes out into the desert as a solitary; if there is an *individual* on earth it is he. Not so. He is not alone even in his solitary cell. That which he is doing, he is doing for the sake of the whole community. 'It is a good thing that the ascetic ideal be incarnated eminently in certain persons, whose speciality, so to speak, it is to represent, almost with excess, this aspect of the ritual life; for they are like so many living models, inciting to effort. Such is the historic rôle of the great ascetics. When their deeds and acts are analyzed in detail, one asks himself what useful end they can have. He is struck by the fact that there is something excessive in the disdain they profess for all that ordinarily impassions men. But these exaggerations are necessary to sustain among the believers a sufficient disgust for an easy life and common pleasures. It is necessary that an élite put the end too high, if the crowd is not to put it too low. It is necessary that some exaggerate, if the average is to remain at a fitting level.

'But asceticism does not serve religious ends only. Here, as elsewhere, religious interests are only the symbolic form of social and moral interests. The ideal beings to whom the cults are addressed are not the only ones who demand of their followers a certain disdain for suffering: society itself is possible only at this price. Though exalting the strength of man, it is frequently rude to individuals; it necessarily demands perpetual sacrifices from them; it is constantly doing violence to our natural appetites, just because it raises us above ourselves. If we are going to fulfil our duties towards it, then we must be prepared to do violence to our instincts sometimes and to ascend the decline of nature

when it is necessary. So there is an asceticism which, being inherent in all social life, is destined to survive all the mythologies and all the dogmas: it is an integral part of all human culture. At bottom, this is the asceticism which is the reason for the existence of and the justification of that which has been taught by the religions of all times.'

The student of Religion may not agree with Dr. Durkheim, but if he attempts to do without this book it will be to his very great loss.

### A TEXT-BOOK OF SOCIOLOGY.

Messrs. Macmillan have published a text-book of Sociology under the title of *Outlines of Sociology* (8s. 6d. net). The authors are Frank W. Blackmar, Ph.D., Professor of Sociology and Economics in the University of Kansas, and John Lewis Gillin, Ph.D., Associate Professor of Sociology in the University of Wisconsin.

Thus the authors are American; and so is the book. The conditions of society dealt with are American conditions; the illustrations are taken from American life. The book is therefore not suitable for class-work in Britain. But for private study it is all the more valuable that its arguments and illustrations are not those which we have heard often before, but are for the most part new, striking, and memorable. It is a work of most refreshing clearness and sanity. The authors believe in what is called 'the social mind,' but they do not believe in socialism. The social mind is 'a convenient term to express the mental unity of our social life. This unity is a very real thing; and even though the term "social mind" is open to many objections because of possible misunderstandings, it is certainly convenient to have such a term to describe the functional unity which arises from interaction between many minds.'

This social mind is not always necessary. For social life 'becomes automatic and does not need direction from the combined will of members of society. The socialists maintain, it is true, that this automatic action is a defect and that social organizations could be so perfected as to carry out minute details of the economic and social life—a system which would leave comparatively little for the individual to do of his own free will. And after all, it is to be doubted whether there would be any improvement of the present system of economic life, were the government to order the number of

bushels of corn, the amount of live stock, or the amount of wheat that could be raised in a given year, and were it to appoint certain groups of people to attend to the various crops. It is doubtful whether the government could, as an agent of the people, make the market any more exact or economical, by a formal attempt to regulate products and prices, than it is made under the voluntary activity of individuals who seek to obtain the largest return for the least sacrifice. Without any attempt to regulate them, therefore, society turns over the larger number of details to the unconscious co-operation of the individuals of a community. Systematically and consciously, however, the social mind occupies itself with the larger problems of the organization of society and devotes its energies to changing the trend of social movements—movements, for example, toward the economic and social emancipation of women, the regulation of the liquor traffic, the control of the trusts, the elimination of vice, and, finally, the movements toward a better understanding of the problems of immigration and eugenics, in order that we may control the quality of our population.'

This attitude is maintained consistently throughout the book, but there is never a word of polemics. At the end of every chapter is given a list of references to relevant literature and a series of questions on the subject of the chapter.

The new volume of the 'Bible Study Textbook Series' is good enough to give the series a name. It is a volume of *Old Testament History*, by Ismar J. Peritz, Ph.D., Professor of Biblical Languages and Literatures, and Willard Ives Professor of the English Bible, in Syracuse University (Abingdon Press; \$1.50 net).

The critical attitude of Dr. Peritz is very much that of Driver in his *Literature of the Old Testament*. That is to say, he is truly critical but conservative of all that science can conserve. And that is the best attitude for a teacher. To be half a century behind is to beat the air; to be even ten years in front is to be isolated and unfruitful. For the man who thinks himself in advance of his contemporaries is, with a few illustrious exceptions, simply off on a side track. Now the purpose of Professor Peritz is educational. His book is wholly directed to that end. He has no satisfaction in your reading his own book if it

does not prepare you to read the Bible. His purpose is to let you into the enjoyment of the best literature in the world by the only door ever open, the door of daily discipline. Yet the book itself is highly attractive and stimulating. Its sketch maps would have been better if they could have waited for Dr. G. A. Smith's *Atlas*. But they are as good as they could be without it.

*The Secret of Human Power* is an ambitious title (Allen & Unwin; 5s. net). Whether the book rises to it we cannot tell. For it is so clever, and so amusing in its erratic cleverness, that the central thought, if there is one, is lost in general amazement and admiration. The sketches in the first part, which are the author's own presumably, are just as humorously clever as the writing. After the first part they turn into diagrams, which need a little more attention for proper appreciation, but repay it. The atmosphere of the war is all around, but it is a clear atmosphere; we see the mischief and the mischief makers, and we see what their end will be. The author of the book is Mr. Haydn Brown.

To his 'Sanctuary Booklets' Mr. Allenson has added Bushnell's essay on *The Character of Jesus* (6d. net). It is an essay that even on such a subject will never become obsolete.

Good reading and encouragement, and all about a great enterprise, is *The Book and the Sword*, a popular illustrated report of the British and Foreign Bible Society for the year 1914-15 (Bible House).

The Rev. H. C. O. Lanchester, M.A., late Fellow of Pembroke College, Cambridge, has adapted Driver's edition of *The Books of Joel and Amos* to the Revised Version, and has added a few supplementary notes (Cambridge: At the University Press; 2s. 6d. net). Mr. Lanchester's notes are not to be neglected. One of them adds a new section to the Introduction to Joel on 'The Integrity of the Book.'

A Commentary on *The Anglican Proper Psalms* has been written by the Rev. C. H. Sellwood Godwin, M.A. (Cambridge: Deighton, Bell & Co.; 4s. 6d. net). It consists of Critical and Exegetical Notes on Obscure and Corrupt Passages in the



Hebrew Text in the Light of Modern Knowledge. Professor Sayce contributes an Introduction, in which he asks why the Hebrew text of the Psalms needs correcting. The Babylonian psalms and hymns are not corrupt.

'As I have recently pointed out in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES,' he says, 'we are now able to compare the text of these in the editions made for the library of Nineveh in the seventh century B.C. with the text of the same liturgical compositions as it appears in tablets written in Babylonia some two thousand years earlier. The variations are astonishingly few: beyond a few additions or alterations introduced in order to adapt the old poems to the conditions of a later age and government the differences are practically confined to the substitution of the later Assyrian suffixes for the fuller forms of the older Babylonian grammar. And the accuracy with which the ancient texts were copied and recopied applies equally to the Semitic versions of them and the Sumerian originals. The words in which they were composed were consecrated, and a mistake in their pronunciation invalidated their recitation. How is it, then, that the text of the Hebrew Psalms has not been handed down with a similar amount of accuracy?'

It is due to the Hebrew consonants being sometimes similar and being written without vowels. Perhaps also the older psalms were adapted to the uses of a later age. Mr. Godwin's work is conservative, and yet it pushes the exegesis of the Psalter a distinct step forward. The Notes are always original and nearly always illuminating.

*The Holiness of Pascal* is a daring topic for a series of public lectures. It is the topic chosen by the Rev. H. F. Stewart, B.D., Fellow and Dean of St. John's College, Cambridge, for the Hulsean Lectures of 1914-15 (Cambridge: At the University Press; 4s. net). There is material in Pascal, both plentiful and appropriate; but the *holiness* of Pascal! And Mr. Stewart *means* his holiness. He uses the word in its proper sense as descriptive of the life which (after his second conversion) Pascal led among men. Not that all the lectures are given to his life of holiness. The first lecture is purely biographical, the second controversial. It is the third and fourth lectures that bring the saint before us; the third telling us how he became a saint, and the fourth how he lived and

died in the rare reality of saintliness. And the point of all is that Pascal was no saint in fact until he was a saint in acceptance. He achieved not holiness; he received it. By his second conversion, which took place at midnight on November 23, 1654, he was 'accepted in the beloved,' and then realized his acceptance by a life of daily new obedience.

It was the Lord's high-priestly prayer on the eve of His Passion that kindled the fire of Pascal's love and faith and loosened his tongue. 'The knowledge of the Father whom the world has not known, the God not of the philosopher and the wise man but of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, and the knowledge of Jesus Christ who reveals Him, bringing eternal life—this is the sum of the message borne in upon Pascal as he cons the seventeenth chapter of St. John that sleepless night. It beats him down upon his knees in bitter grief for the sins which have kept him in darkness. "I have severed myself from Him: shunned Him, denied Him, crucified Him." It raises him to stand erect, conscious of his inherent dignity. "Greatness of the human soul." It sets free the springs of living waters which were sealed, and the fountains of his tears—tears of penitence and joy. It fills his heart with certainty, happiness, and peace; it thrills his deepest chords. "Certitude, Certitude. Feeling, Joy, Peace. Joy, joy, joy, tears of joy." Henceforth the Gospel, which has not now merely fallen on his ear but has reached his heart, shall be his only guide in the short passage through present troubles to eternal bliss. Earth and all save God are put away. "I will not forget thy word." The whole curve of the progress towards the freedom of the sons of God, with its alternations of rise and fall, is traced in this page of broken utterance. The joy is mixed with trembling, but certainty prevails. Not the cool certainty of the intellect convinced by argument, but the touch with reality, the sense of actual presence of God with the heart.'

Mr. Walter Wood has interviewed soldiers home from the War, wounded soldiers mostly, and got from their own lips the story of their experiences. These stories he has written down, taking care to add nothing of his own. He has even submitted the typescripts of their narratives to the soldiers themselves before putting them in type. In this way he is able to offer us a narrative of events

from the first day on which the British Expeditionary Force began to fight at Mons down to the great victory of Neuve Chapelle, in a series of chapters each of which is the record of some thrilling experience. The book is illustrated by impressive pictures, all true in effect, there is little doubt, however imaginary in detail. The title of the book is *Soldiers' Stories of the War* (Chapman & Hall; 6s. net).

The Bishop of Durham has written the Preface to a book on the call to missionary service, of which the author is Mrs. E. May Crawford, 'herself an honoured missionary, now reluctantly retiring with health broken in the work.' The title of the book is *Called* (Ch. Miss. Soc.; 2s. 6d.). It contains examples of God's call, as it has been heard by missionaries from Abraham to some of those who are yet alive. Besides these, there are three preliminary chapters, one on 'The Glory of God's Call,' one on 'The Call for Missionary Service,' and one on 'How to Distinguish God's Call.'

How *does* one distinguish God's call? In four ways, says Mrs. Crawford—through the Word, through one's inward convictions, through circumstances, and through the inworking of the Holy Spirit.

From the whole book Dr. Moule has received two impressions afresh. 'One is the "living, bright reality" of the contact, spirit with spirit, between "the only true God" and man. The other is the greatness and glory of the call to missionary service. Truly that service is, *in itself*, the noblest upon earth. The best service for each Christian man and woman, the best for the *individual*, is the service, highest or humblest, which the Master chooses. But as to types of service in themselves, the greatest calling is the missionary's. Thrice happy they who hear it, and who obey.'

Mr. Humphrey Milford of the Oxford University Press is the publisher in this country for the Columbia University. He has issued *The History of Tyre* (6s. 6d. net), by Wallace B. Fleming, Ph.D. It is one of the Columbia University Oriental Studies.

The book is not written with literary charm, but it contains all that is known about Tyre. And in spite of the absence of style one can read it without fatigue. It is good to find a book that

tells us all about anything. It saves the reading of so many other books. And it is especially good to find a book that can be relied upon. Dr. Fleming is a most unwearied investigator. No reference to this 'city in the sea' has escaped him, in ancient author or in modern. And all the sources are set forth accurately in footnotes. What a romantic story is that of Tyre. It has gone out of history now; but up to the time of its disappearance, its story vies in interest with that of Damascus or Jerusalem.

Mr. Stephen Graham has translated into English three conversations by Vladimir Solovyof on *War and Christianity from the Russian Point of View* (Constable; 4s. 6d. net).

Vladimir Solovyof, the author of this book, is 'Russia's greatest philosopher and one of the greatest of her poets, a serene and happy writer.' He was born in 1853, and died in 1901, that is, he flourished in Russia during the same years as Nietzsche lived in Germany. 'He was a seeker and also a seer, a thinker and also a singer. His life is not marked by irritability, and it did not culminate in mental and psychic collapse as did the life of Nietzsche. Probably life was easier for a man of genius in Russia than in Germany—there are wider spaces there, more freedom, more tenderness between man and man, less materialism, less selfishness, less to send one mad.' Thus Mr. Graham.

Solovyof issued *War and Christianity* in 1900, the year before his death. It was written to oppose the teaching and influence of Tolstoy; for in all his work and faith he was opposed to Tolstoy, considering Tolstoyism to be a sort of moral atrophy. We need not to be told, therefore, where Solovyof is in the controversy as to the legitimacy of war. The conversations are extraordinarily clever. No points are made merely to be answered. And the persons are real and vivid, sitting there in flesh and blood and separately discernible before many pages are read.

The theological, and still more the ethical, questions raised by the War are discussed by the Rev. E. Griffith-Jones, B.A., D.D., Principal of the Yorkshire United Independent College, Bradford, in a series of addresses and essays gathered into a volume with the title *The Challenge of Christianity to a World at War* (Duckworth; 2s. 6d. net).



What is his solution? In one word, there is no solution. For the questions raised by the War touch, every one of them, the moral freedom of man, and it is impossible for us to explain man's moral freedom. But if they cannot be rationally answered, enough can be said to satisfy the mind of what Mr. Balfour calls 'the plain man.' We take certain things for granted. We cannot explain them, but we can and do live by them. And on that philosophy of common sense, Principal Griffith-Jones finds room enough for belief in the constant watchful care of a loving Heavenly Father. He never says, and would never allow, that war is 'part of God's providential government'; but he is able to show with sufficient authority that that which is due to the wrath of man may work out the righteous will of God which is our sanctification. The note of the addresses and papers is sweet reasonableness. The foundation of their confidence is personal faith in a God who spared not His own Son. It is not God that is challenged by the War, it is materialism. For just at the time when a materialistic interpretation of the Universe seems to obtain its triumph in militarism, the soul of the individual finds its comfort and its majestic courage in the thought of a God who is not unmindful.

How to develop the powers of the mind and give the mind the dominion over the body is the problem which W. R. C. Latson, M.D., sets out to solve in *Secrets of Mental Supremacy* (Fowler; 2s. 6d. net). There is no royal road. All the exercises that are recommended demand discipline. For developing the power of 'auditory imagination,' for example, the following methods are recommended:

(1) 'Recall to mind the words and melody of some familiar song as rendered by a good singer, and imagine how it sounds. Hear the words, note the quality of the voice and accompaniment. Three or four songs, or three or four repetitions of the same song, are enough for once.'

(2) 'Call up in your memory one at a time the various sounds of the country and hear them in imagination—the hum of bees, the sound of the wind, the rustling leaves, the cries of the various birds, the lowing of cattle, and other noises peculiar to the life of the country.'

The influence of the mind on the body is well

recognized in our day. Have we recognized the influence on the body of the *soul*? That is the subject of a remarkable book by Annie Rix Militz entitled *The Renewal of the Body* (Fowler; 2s. 6d. net). The shape of the shoulders depends not on the burdens they carry, but on the spirit in which the burdens are carried. Even the heart is affected by the soul. 'Spiritual enlightenment makes the body translucent. The X-ray has shown that there is much difference between the bodies of human beings. The writer once saw by the X-ray the hearts of two young men as a dark object in the chest of each with a slight pulsating movement. But the heart of one of them showed very much more clearly than the other. He was devoted to Truth and very pure in mind, while the other was living an ordinary life in the world.'

Miracles do not occur, said Professor Huxley. Do they not? Mr. E. Howard Grey, D.D.S., has filled a volume of five hundred and thirty-two pages with the record of miracles that have taken place in our own day. His title is fairly comprehensive—*Visions, Previsions, and Miracles in Modern Times* (Fowler; 5s. net). But they are all miracles, that is to say, there is a supernatural agency understood to be at work in them all; they do not occur after the known laws of nature. Many of them are spiritualistic. As regards their evidence, Mr. Grey is not quite convincing always, or perhaps often, but he is sincerely desirous to persuade us of the truth of his miracles, and he has taken some trouble to find it.

A sympathetic and unexaggerated description of the subconscious and all akin phenomena will be found in *The Subconscious and the Superconscious Planes of Mind*, by William Walker Atkinson (Fowler; 2s. 6d. net). Much hysterical writing has been published on the new psychology recently; Mr. Atkinson will have nothing to do with it. He does not believe, for instance, that the study of the subconscious lends countenance to belief in reincarnation. One of the arguments for reincarnation is the evidence of memory of a past that the person never experienced. These experiences, Mr. Atkinson believes to be due to race memory. He gives this case by way of example: 'A young man visited a small place in England, and stopped at an old inn. The moment he entered the room he was overcome by the sense

of familiarity with the surroundings. He seemed to have a clear recollection of having been in the same room before—many years before. He stated his impressions to a friend who was with him, and finally said, "If I have ever been here before, I then wrote my name with a diamond on the lowest window-pane of that left-hand window." They approached the window, and there in the corner of the pane was a name scratched with a diamond, as the young man had stated. But it was not *his* name, but the name of his grandfather, accompanied by a date showing it to have been written there when the latter was a young man.'

The Rev. Gavin Carlyle, M.A., has prepared a volume of *Selections from the Collected Writings of Edward Irving* (Gardner; 3s. 6d. net). No man knows Irving's writings better. We may depend upon it that the best things are here, however many good things have had to be left out. The selections are grouped under descriptive titles—The Book of Psalms, David and the Psalms, On Prayer, Prayer and Action, On Praise,—these first. Then come social questions—Matrimony, Duties of Parents to Children, Duty to Parents, Duty to the Poor. The last great section touches the Gospel and the Redeemer—The Temptations of Christ, Christ and the Human Soul, Evidence of Truth as to the Origin of Christianity, The Heralds of the Gospel, On Envy, On the Word of God, Liberty of Prophesying.

Edward Irving is in some ways like Edmund Spenser. He used language that belonged to an earlier age than his own, as Spenser did; and he used it with the same effect of sublimity and sincerity. He is the preacher's preacher, as Spenser is the poet's poet. We do not think that the ordinary layman reads Irving now, perhaps few preachers read him largely, but preachers will read this selection from his work and be mightily profited thereby.

Messrs. Harrap have undertaken the publication of a series of books to be known as the 'Great Nations' series. The title reminds one of Fisher Unwin's 'Story of the Nations.' But the two enterprises are different. The 'Story of the Nations' is history pure and simple; the 'Great Nations' includes all that belongs to a nation—Art, Architecture, Religion, History, Biography, Language and Literature. Both series are profusely and

admirably illustrated, but again Messrs. Harrap illustrate architecture and art quite as freely as politics or life.

The first volume to reach us is *Medieval Italy*, by Mr. H. B. Cotterill (7s. 6d. net). It covers a thousand years of history (305–1313). But, great as the period is, the treatment is fairly adequate, for the volume is one of 565 pages, and every page is well occupied.

This is the method of procedure. The thousand years are divided into five periods. Each period is introduced by a historical outline. Then the great matters falling within it are discussed with fulness in separate chapters. Thus, after the Historical Outline of the fifth period, come four chapters, one on Religious Movement, one on the Republics and Signories, one on Art, and one on Italian Language and Literature.

It is an immense range of subject for one man to cover, but Mr. Cotterill has covered it creditably. He has hit the right middle between the popularly oratorical and the dry annalistic style, and he has been able to keep his pages clear of all details that are unconstructive and unfruitful. Here and there a useful Note, as that on Mosaics or that on Coins, gives him the opportunity of gathering together matters which do instruct but are difficult to carry along with the historical or biographical narrative.

It will not be easy, we are not sure if it will be possible, for the ordinary reader to find a book which will enlighten for him the Dark Ages in Italy more satisfactorily than this book.

There are living American preachers who are better known in Britain than the Rev. Frederick A. Noble, D.D., LL.D. He will catch up most of them when his new book is read. Its title is *Spiritual Culture* (Hodder & Stoughton; 6s.). It may well be, and probably is, a volume of sermons; but the sermons are not so unsocial as usual. They do not lie in the book as unrelated units. They all have to do with spirituality and its cultivation, and they are arranged in a progressive order. You may read one by itself and be content, but you will be properly appreciative of one when you have read the whole. Take, for example, the 'Aids to Spiritual Culture.' They are High Aspirations, the Exercise of Faith, Prayer, Reading, Meditation, Service, the Right Use of Sorrow, the Reception of the Power of the Spirit, and Intimate Fellowship



with Christ. Read the chapter on Prayer alone and find it good for edification, but read it in its place in the series and find it better.

Professor Charles Foster Kent of Yale has done as much as any living man we can think of (Dr. Driver is dead) for the scientific study of the Old Testament. Besides other enterprises in which he has a part, he is the author of *The Student's Old Testament*, itself great enough to be one man's life-work and monument.

A new volume of 'The Student's Old Testament' has been issued. Its title is *The Songs, Hymns, and Prayers of the Old Testament* (Hodder & Stoughton; 12s. net). Only those who have seen one or more of the previous volumes can have or can be given any clear conception of the manner and wealth of matter which the volume contains. First there are fifty pages of an introduction, which discusses shortly the general characteristics of Hebrew Poetry and its different types, the structure and authorship of the Book of Lamentations, the origin and interpretation of the Song of Songs, Music and Song in the Temple Service, the literary and historical background of the Psalter and its structure and history. Then the Songs, Hymns, and Prayers are given in a new translation, which aims at reproducing the measured beat and the strophic rhythm of the original Hebrew, so that general students of literature, as well as special students of the Bible, may enjoy the matchless beauty both of the form and the thought of these Hebrew classics.

The Songs are divided into Tribal and National Songs, Songs of Lamentation, Songs of Love and Marriage. The Hymns are grouped under Kingly and Messianic Psalms, Hymns of Praise and Thanksgiving, and Hymns of Adoration and Trust. The Prayers are all found in the Psalter, for it must be remembered that in this volume Dr. Kent has to do with poetry only, and there seem to be no poetical prayers anywhere else.

One of the general things we are thankful for is this. Professor Kent believes the text of the Psalms as it stands is on the whole trustworthy. He has to make corrections and even conjectural emendations, but he has never been brought under the dominion of the conjectural mania. We quote his translation of the 23rd Psalm:

Jehovah is my shepherd, I shall not want,  
He maketh me to lie down in grassy meadows,  
He leadeth me to the waters of the resting  
place,  
He continually restoreth my life.

He guideth me in the paths of righteousness  
for his name's sake;  
Yea, though I walk through the valley of  
gloom,  
I fear no evil, for it is thou who art with me,  
Thy rod and thy staff—they, indeed, comfort  
me.

Thou spreadest a table before me in the  
presence of mine enemies,  
Thou hast anointed my head with oil; my cup  
runneth over,  
Surely goodness and mercy shall follow me all  
the days of my life;  
And I shall dwell in the house of Jehovah for  
ever and ever.

Messrs. Killick & Fowler have issued *A Treasury of Many Thoughts*, as a Calendar for 1916. No out-of-the-way author has been read for the quotations; but Marcus Aurelius and Shakespeare and Ruskin and Tennyson are quoted freely.

We do not think that any attempt to rewrite the Pilgrim's Progress has ever yet been successful. And we cannot say that the attempt of Mr. H. G. Tunnickliff, B.A., is an exception. His idea is to simplify the language and select the scenes that the youngest may understand. And so he calls his book *A Child's Pilgrim's Progress* (Kelly; 1s. 6d. net). But the youngest understand already. There are some long words perhaps, but is it long words that ever block the way of the little ones? Do they not take the long as easily as the short if they are real and expressive? Perhaps the book will be to some the first step to the Pilgrim's Progress itself, and its attractively coloured pictures will help it to that accomplishment.

Dr. Samuel Daiches of the Jews' College in London, has written an account of the part Lord Kitchener took in the Survey of Palestine. The title of the book is *Lord Kitchener and his Work in Palestine* (Luzac; 2s. 6d. net). The book is

both opportune and important. It tells us the story of the least known portion of Lord Kitchener's busy life; and it quotes so freely from his reports as to give us much information about the Holy Land—the information, moreover, of a keen eye and clear head.

Professor G. Elliot Smith, M.A., M.D., has republished from the Memoirs and Proceedings of the Manchester Literary and Philosophical Society, his monograph *On the Significance of the Geographical Distribution of the Practice of Mummification* (Manchester, 36 George Street; 2s. 6d.). He believes that the practice of embalming the dead is an integral part of what has been called 'heliolithic culture.' To the same widespread culture belong many other phenomena and customs, such as megalithic monuments, the worship of the sun and the serpent, the custom of piercing the ears, tattooing, circumcision, the curious custom known as couvade, the practice of massage, and the stories of the Creation and the Flood. It is therefore as a contribution to the study of heliolithic culture that he offers this elaborate paper on embalming.

We know of no philosopher, ancient, mediæval, or modern, who has been so neglected as Bowne. Says Eucken: 'Bowne was a philosopher of America, and as such all America may be proud of him and of his memory.' But America is not proud of him. America does not know him. Neither America nor any other English-speaking country can be said to have discovered him. He died quite recently, and recognition will come with time; but it ought to have come before he died.

What is the cause of the disparagement?—for neglect is disparagement. It is due to his religiousness. That is a fatal flaw in a philosopher. Bowne came by the ways of philosophy to believe in the God of the Bible. He believed in the God of our Lord Jesus Christ. And the philosophers would not have him.

His philosophy is called Personalism. It is clearly and competently described by Mr. Ralph Tyler Flewelling in a volume entitled *Personalism and the Problems of Philosophy* (Methodist Book Concern; \$1 net).

The mingled horror and heroism of the War is illustrated almost on every page of *The Diary of a*

*French Army Chaplain* (Melrose; 3s. 6d. net). The chaplain is Abbé Félix Klein of the American Hospital in Paris. 'Just now I administered the last Sacraments to a Reservist badly wounded in the head, and that we had believed safe. The recovery was still so partial that a small indiscretion on his part suddenly put him back into a dangerous state, and now he is quite delirious. Reasonable and quite gentle about everything else, he is absolutely determined to rejoin his comrades as quickly as possible at the Front.

'I assure him, alas! that he shall soon depart, and besides, knowing him to be a firm Christian, I ask him if he will not, so as to fortify his soul against all dangers, receive Absolution, Communion, and the Sacrament for the Sick. He willingly consents, and, his fixed idea not gainsaid, he fulfils his religious duty with great calmness and lucidity. A few minutes later, as I sit beside his bed, he begins once more to talk to me about going; he even gets excited, and in an eager voice encourages the others on to battle. Then, again he says good-bye to me. Without any pretence I accept his adieus, and give him mine; after which I embrace him and leave, lest I should weep.'

Messrs. Nisbet have published an anonymous book on *The Lord's Prayer in Daily Life* (1s. 6d. net). One idea, applicable to daily life, is found in each petition and made urgent. Thus in 'Give us this day our daily bread,' the attention is turned to 'daily,' and the lesson is of daily trust in God's good providing.

Day by day the manna fell:  
O, to learn this lesson well!  
Still by constant mercy fed,  
Give me, Lord, my daily bread.

The 'Lincoln Books' are to be issued by the Society of SS. Peter and Paul. The first two volumes are reprints from the works of Bishop Challoner. The first is called *The Fifteen Mysteries*, the second *The Lord's Prayer and the Angelic Salutation*. They are printed and bound attractively. For Christmas gifts Catholics will be sure to be drawn to them.

A valuable though unpretentious study of *Astronomical Allusions in Sacred Books of the East*



has been made by Mrs. Walter Maunder. It was made for a paper read before the Victoria Institute, and now published separately (1s.). The books ransacked for their astronomical allusions are the *Vendidad*, the *Bundahish*, 4 *Ezra*, the *Slavonic Enoch*, the *Ethiopic Enoch*, and the *Book of Jubilees*.

Mr. Arthur Machen, journalist, who believes that an imaginative article of his in the *Weekly Dispatch* was the sole source and origin of the story of the Angels of Mons, has reprinted that article, along with some others, under the title of *The Bowmen* (Simpkin; 1s. net). He has written an introduction, in which he expresses his contempt for those who believe such tales, and lays the blame for their credulity on 'the shoulders of the majority of the Church of England, who,' he says, 'pass their time in preaching, not the eternal mysteries, but a twopenny morality, in changing the Wine of Angels and the Bread of Heaven into ginger-beer and mixed biscuits.'

He also says this: 'I have long maintained that on the whole the average church, considered as a house of preaching, is a much more poisonous place than the average tavern.' Now all this may be effective though unrefined journalism, but is it true? How did Mr. Machen obtain his average?—we mean the average church, not the average tavern.

Under the title of *Meditation* (Simpkin; 5s. net), Mr. Arthur Lovell has published a book in which he asserts that Christ and Christianity have been utterly misunderstood for two thousand years, and sets forth their true meaning. The ideas that have been associated with Christ are Atonement and Divinity; and to Christianity has been added worship of the Virgin Mary. Now, he believes and asserts positively that not only was Mary an ordinary woman, but Jesus was an ordinary man. He was put to death in an ordinary way and with ordinary results. All that was found objectionable in Him was His teaching, which was grossly misunderstood. Thus: 'In the twenty-third chapter of Matthew, the Scribes and Pharisees are likened to whited sepulchres which are within full of dead men's bones and of all uncleanness. It is easy to picture what would happen in the mental condition of a mob in Jerusalem at that period of development. The first impulse would be to take the

words literally, that the Scribes and Pharisees had murdered a lot of people and kept their bones in their own houses for safety. This would be repeated to the priests by their emissaries, who mingled with the crowd in order to catch Jesus somehow or other. Then a more lurid version would be propagated by some one whose imagination would conjure a vision of bones piled up to the ceiling in the chief priest's residence. This story would be certain to spread like wildfire amongst the mob, and the priests would be terrified at the idea of a crowd rushing to demand where were the bones that they had hidden. The chief priest would then consider it a favourable opportunity of settling old scores by taking Jesus before the Roman Governor, and accusing him of inciting the people to rioting and disorder. Pilate, a shrewd and honest man of the world, saw through the game that was played by the priests, but was forced to comply with their wishes, through the threat—a very real source of danger to himself—of appealing to Rome on the ground that he would be neglecting his duties as a Roman magistrate, if he released such a dangerous prisoner.'

That is how the crucifixion of Jesus came about. Mr. Lovell is very emphatic in denunciation of the imagination of the Church, but he does a little imagining himself, we see, when the occasion needs it. The book is written to encourage us to think.

A small volume of evangelistic addresses by Mr. Northcote Deck, M.B., Ch.M., of the South Sea Evangelical Mission, has been published by Messrs. Morgan & Scott, under the title of *The Credentials of the Cross* (2s. 6d. net). From the beginning of the volume to the end of it the emphasis is laid on faith. It might be called an exposition of the place and power of faith in the Christian life. And truly we are much in need of such an exposition.

Messrs. Pickering & Inglis have added Mr. T. D. Bernard's Bampton Lecture of 1864 on *The Progress of Doctrine* to their 'Every Christian's Library' (1s. net).

The Religious Tract Society have issued their four Annuals.

First, *The Boy's Own Annual* (8s.), containing all the numbers for the year of *The Boy's Own Paper*. Needless to say, it is a war volume. In

the Index, words like Army, Artillery, Gun, Navy, Trenches occur frequently. Some of the best stories of the War have been captured for it. But it is not forgotten that boys, especially small boys, have other interests than reading the newspapers or even scouting. The five serial stories are by capable writers, Captain Charles Gilson, Paul Blake, A. L. Haydon, Jules Verne (*Kongre, the Wrecker; or, The Lighthouse at the End of the World*), and Harold Allan.

Next, *The Girl's Own Annual* (8s.) contains the year's issues of *The Girl's Own Paper* and *Woman's Magazine*. Its best feature, first to catch the eye and last to stay in the mind, is its illustrations. Every year sees improvement in the illustrating of serial fiction. The highest attainable has not yet been reached, but here the illustrations are finely finished as well as true to life. That difficult combination of the useful and the ornamental which it is proper for all well-conditioned women to desire, is presented with wonderful skill and resourcefulness in the pictures as well as in the papers. Among the numerous and captivating short sketches will be found the narrative of a visit to the home of Dr. Maria Montessori, the revolutionary in the training of children.

The third and fourth are *The Empire Annual for Boys* and *The Empire Annual for Girls* (3s. 6d. each). They are both edited by the Rev. A. R. Buckland, M.A., after the same manner. That is to say, both volumes contain short stories and short articles contributed by the accepted writers of the day. But the articles and the stories are not alike in both volumes. Here the ability of the editor has its opportunity. It is easy to have articles for girls on Lawn Tennis and the Village Nurse, and for boys on Alfred the Great and Travel in Egypt. But it is not so easy to have all the stories good and yet have the boys' stories good for boys and the girls' stories good for girls.

If the Theological Colleges of America continue their present policy of encouraging the systematic study of the Bible, they will make a scientific knowledge of it more general in America than it is in any other country. Every month some new scheme is published. This month there appears a small volume with the title *How to Study the Old Testament* (Scribners). It is prepared as a companion to President F. K. Sanders' *History of*

*the Hebrews*. Other books are also recommended for reading, but for this book it gives a synopsis and sets questions on every chapter. Let us convey some idea of the scheme of study by quoting

#### Lesson 50.

THE RELIGIOUSLY SIGNIFICANT HALF CENTURY  
(750-700 B.C.)

Read

SHH (Sanders' *History*), 266-268.

*Note carefully the following facts:*

1. That four great prophets did their work within this half century.
2. That they insisted on expressing religion predominantly in terms of character.
3. That much of the biblical material recording the events and ideas of the age is first-hand material.
4. That the contact of the Hebrew people with all-conquering Assyria forced them to a new and infinitely broader conception of the world and of Jehovah as its supreme ruler.
5. That the chronology contains several insoluble problems.

*Questions to be answered:*

1. Who were the four great prophets of this period?
2. What change of emphasis in religion did they advocate?
3. What varied material descriptive of this period is found in 2 Kings?
4. What Assyrian records contribute to a thorough comprehension of the period politically?
5. What two great historical events are attested by both biblical and Assyrian records?

*Optional Reading References:*

See SHH, Appendix 2, page 344, section 268.

A simple and sensible introduction to an art that is supposed to need no introduction has been written by the Rev. T. J. Walker, M.A. Its title is *Preaching for Beginners* (Skeffingtons; 1s. 6d. net). Mr. Walker has the courage of his convictions, and one of his convictions is that there is no preaching like extempore preaching. And that is true when extempore preaching is good. Well, he says it may always be good, if we will take time and pains to make it good.

A number of simple direct evangelical booklets



have been published at 'Rosel,' Wimbledon, S.W., for the use of officers and others (1d. each). Their titles are (1) *The Greatest of all Mistakes*; (2) *Undoubtedly He is Coming Again*; (3) *The Supreme Moment of a Lifetime*; (4) *The Inevitable Separation*; (5) *Is Real Peace Possible?*

*You Can*—that is the title of 'A Collection of Brief Talks on the most Important Topic in the World—Your Success' (Simpkin; 2s. net). The talker is Mr. George Matthew Adams. Success is the making of money. But it should be made honestly. There are other things in the world besides money, though they do not count for success; so money should be made quickly and cleverly, but honestly. One way to get on is to 'kick to grow.' Let us quote that chapter; it will stand for the whole book:

KICK.

Kick to Grow.

But Kick ahead and not behind. Kick to get Something and to get Somewhere. Kick to a good purpose. For to rightly Kick is to be Somebody.

Kick to Grow.

France Kicked itself into the French Revolution and cleared the Political map of Europe for centuries to come; Wendell Phillips Kicked against human Slavery and helped free a Race; Disraeli Kicked against a great horde of Kickers and it landed him Prime Minister of England. History favours Kickers.

Kick to Grow.

Kick with a Smile on your Face and Determination in your Heart. For the Kicking Business fares badly with Bitterness and Revenge taking tickets at the Gate. Kick the hardest against your own Faults and Defects. Also, Kick against everything useless—Time wasting, cheap Gossip, aimless People—Habits that sap away your Power.

Kick to Grow.

Kick for recognition when you have real Worth to show. Kick for Knowledge. Kick for Principle. Kick for a place on which to stand squarely and honestly. But in all your Kicking, remember that the Kicking is the Means and not the End. And after you have Kicked your Kick—pass on, and achieve your Task.

Kick to Grow.

## The Garden of Eden and the Fall of Man according to the Sumerians.

BY THE REV. A. H. SAYCE, D.LITT., LL.D., D.D., PROFESSOR OF ASSYRIOLOGY IN THE UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD.

A VERY important volume has just been added to the publications of the University of Pennsylvania. This is Dr. Langdon's account of his discovery of the early Sumerian legend of Paradise and the Fall of Man which he found among the cuneiform tablets from Nippur of the Abrahamic age now in the Museum of Philadelphia.<sup>1</sup> The book contains a copy of the text, together with its transliteration and translation, an interesting introduction in which the legend is compared with the South Babylonian legend of Adamu on the same subject, and full indices. A portion of the tablet was discovered and copied by Dr. Langdon in 1912, and

a paper upon it was read by him before the Society of Biblical Archæology in the following year.

The legend is in Sumerian, and there is no Semitic translation to assist the decipherer. Only those who know what this means, and how abominably bad, moreover, is the cursive cuneiform script of the Khammurabi period, can fully appreciate the learning and scholarship which have surmounted the difficulties of translation and made the long story intelligible. Much, of course, still remains to be done; the intricacies of the Sumerian language are still imperfectly known, and there are many words and sentences the exact signification of which must at present remain doubtful. Indeed, I am afraid that the ordinary reader will regard the

<sup>1</sup> *The Sumerian Epic of Paradise, the Flood, and the Fall of Man*. By Stephen Langdon, University Museum, Philadelphia, 1915.

whole legend as it appears in the translation as nothing but a nightmare of incoherencies and will wonder whether the old Sumerian scribes had any idea of what we mean by sense and reason.

This is in large measure due to Dr. Langdon not having divested himself of his original belief that the legend had to do with the Deluge. The fragment of the tablet he had copied, and which he showed to me at Oxford, referred to the land being covered by water as well as to a boat, and it was therefore natural that we should have thought we had a Sumerian version of the Deluge before us. Now that the whole tablet has been substantially recovered, it is evident that it contains nothing of the sort. Along with the Deluge must go the explanation of the name of the hero as the equivalent of the Semitic Noah. The explanation which was due to a suggestion of my own, has been practically withdrawn by Dr. Langdon, and in this he is unquestionably right. Tagtug, as the name is provisionally (but certainly wrongly) transcribed, is a gardener who appears only in the latter part of the story, and may possibly be mentioned in a list of deities published by the British Museum (in *Cuneiform Texts*, xxv. 27, iii. 4, where the pronunciation of the name is stated to be Ziz).

The legend begins with an account of the creation of the Sumerian Paradise in the land of Dilmun, which Dr. Langdon is certainly correct in placing to the south-east of Babylonia. Its situation was thus the same as that of the Biblical Garden of Eden which was similarly at the eastern end of the Babylonian plain, where it was washed by the ocean-river. But the ocean-river was salt; hence the soil of Dilmun had to be inundated or 'washed' by the four rivers which flowed into—or, as the Sumerians said, out of—the ocean-river, the modern Persian Gulf, before it could be transformed into a garden, and become a *gan*, or 'enclosure,' for mankind. Hence Ea or Ki-en and the mother-goddess undertook to irrigate it, and accordingly 'Nin-kharsag inundated the fields,' which 'received the waters of Ea.' This is in strict accordance with the Biblical statement which tells us (Gn 2<sup>5, 6</sup>) how, before Paradise became fit for human habitation, it was watered by means of the *ēdh*, or 'inundation.' *Edh* is the Babylonian *ēdu*, the technical term borrowed from the Sumerian *ēdē*, which signified 'the inundation' of Ea, and included both the tidal wash of the Persian

Gulf, and more especially the annual inundation of the ground by the rivers which flowed into the Gulf. It was to this annual inundation that the Babylonian delta owed its fertility, and the salt pool of Dilmun became a well of pure water. For nine months long the inundation was spread over the land, as is still the case in Southern Babylonia wherever the canals are kept in order, and everything was thus made ready for the creation of a garden, and the appearance of a gardener. It was this part of the tablet, divorced from its context, which led Dr. Langdon and myself to believe that there was a reference to the Flood, though we ought to have noticed that nothing was said about rain.

The mother-goddess now comes forward to beget vegetation, which (or something like it) must be the signification of the word *ya-lum*, a compound of *ya*, 'juice,' at the end of the second column. It appropriately covered 'the river-bank.' The passage which follows is with our present imperfect knowledge of Sumerian extremely difficult to interpret. The goddess's 'angel,' we are told, summoned certain 'divine anointed ones, and 'she did not repudiate'—so I should translate the Sumerian word, 'the saintly sons of men.' But we are not told where either of the two came from, unless 'the sons of men' are included in the *ya-lum* begotten by the goddess, and the following lines in which mention is made of 'my king' who 'sets his foot' upon a river-boat, yield at present but little sense. If I am right in my interpretation of the second column of the Reverse, 'my king' would be the god Ea. The line which Dr. Langdon translates with a query, 'Doubly he caulked the ship; torches he lighted,' I should render: 'he lighted the censer, he purified with fire,' and in the following line we should read: 'Ea inundated the fields.'

After the creation of vegetation, Tagtug, 'the gardener,' appears upon the scene. The ideograph of divinity attached to his name would seem to indicate that he was one of 'the divine anointed ones.' Ea now sits as king in the temple of Dilmun, and receives from Tagtug the fruits of the garden (cf. Gn 2<sup>15</sup>). Meanwhile the mother-goddess causes various plants to grow, assigning 'destinies' to each class of them, six classes being good for food, a seventh class only being poisonous (see Gn 2<sup>16, 17</sup>). Here it seems to me that Dr. Langdon has overlooked what the sense demands



should be the subjects of the verbs. In Rev 2<sup>2</sup> it must be: 'My king (*i.e.* Ea who had already seated himself as king in the temple) said of the woody plants,' and in line 34 the subject is, not 'my king' as supplied by Dr. Langdon, but the erring mortal, whoever he was, who ate the poisonous plant and thereby brought death into the world.<sup>1</sup> That he should have done so was really the fault of Ea, as in the legend of Adamu: Ea had bidden the man eat of it, not knowing, apparently, that the goddess had put a ban upon the plant in her heart. 'The vision of life when he dies he shall not see,' she exclaims, while the spirits of the underworld sit down to weep, and the goddess goes to the god Ellil in anger to ask how Ea could thus have led man astray. As a result man ceases to be immortal and divine, and becomes a twofold being, man and wife, each the common offspring of the mother-goddess. Ellil now intervenes, and seven deities are appointed to provide man with the necessities of existence, for, it would seem, the lotos-eating life of Paradise is no longer to be his. The first of them presides over agriculture, the second over Magan or Northern Arabia, with its population of nomad herdsmen, the following five look after the health and needs of the individual, while the seventh is to be lord of Dilmun.

In his introduction Dr. Langdon has poured out of his abundant stores of learning a wealth of material from both Sumerian and classical sources which illustrates the legend he has discovered.

<sup>1</sup> It should be noticed that in the Biblical account of Paradise the name of the man is not given. He is always 'the man,' except in Gn 3<sup>21</sup>, which seems to be a marginal gloss.

As he points out, this latter is the legend of Nippur or Northern Babylonia in contradistinction to the story of Adamu, which was the Southern Babylonian attempt to explain how death entered the world. Dr. Langdon still reads the latter name as 'Adapa,' but the Hittite legend of Adamu and Sargon, written in the literary Assyrian of Boghaz-Keui, which I am publishing in the *Proceedings of the Society of Biblical Archaeology*, has now verified my transcription of it. The introduction is full of valuable facts and suggestions, though naturally on several points there will be differences of opinion among scholars. What my own view is of the antediluvian genealogies of Genesis and their relation to the list of Berossos will be seen from what I have written on the subject in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES some years ago (June 1911, pp. 429-430). Dr. Langdon has apparently not noticed that both in Genesis and in Berossos the first two names are later additions to the original lists which began with Enos and its synonym Amelon, and that Cain or Cainan with its Babylonian synonym Ammenon, 'the artizan,' was necessarily the representative of the civilized population of Babylonia. This population was agricultural as well as industrial in opposition to the nomad Sutu, whose representative was known under the varying forms of Abel and Jabal. Nor can I see any reason for doubting Professor Hommel's explanation of the name Amempsinos as Amel-Sin, 'the man of the moon-god,' since Amempsinos is the correspondent of Methuselah and Methusael in the Biblical lists, and these are certainly the Babylonian Mutu-sa-arkhi, 'the man of the moon-god' and Mutu-sa-ili, 'the man of the god.'

## Contributions and Comments.

### Psalms cxvi. 1.

'I WILL lift up mine eyes unto the hills, from whence cometh my help.'

This verse has long been a *crux interpretum*. The difficulty is that the second clause is not relative but interrogative. Delitzsch in his commentary (Eng. tr., 1889) says: 'To render "from whence my help cometh" (Luther) is inadmissible. *⁂* is an interrogative particle, as it is also in Jos

2<sup>4</sup> ["but I wist not whence they were"], where the question is an indirect one'; and he renders: 'I lift up mine eyes unto the mountains: Whence will my help come?' The LXX have the same rendering, and so also the R.V. But this is surely a direct question, not indirect.

Professor Briggs, in the 'International Critical Commentary,' accordingly pronounces the phrase to be a direct question: 'Whence cometh my help?' Dr. Cheyne (*The Book of Psalms*, 1904) quotes

Giesebrecht: 'If the clause contain a question, the Hebrew is of the choicest, but the context does not render this view very probable. . . . If we fall back on the view that the clause is a relative one, we cannot acquit our poet of writing in a rather corrupt style' (*Z.A.T.W.* 1881, p. 284). He accordingly alters the Hebrew text.

It is well known, however, that in Hebrew an indirect question is of the same form as the direct, as in the example cited by Delitzsch above: 'I know not, whence are they?' A better example is Gn 8<sup>s</sup>, which runs literally: 'He sent forth a dove from him to see, Are the waters abated?' Moreover, the verb on which the indirect question depends may be omitted, as in Jer 6<sup>16</sup>: 'Ask for the old paths, where is the good way,' where the LXX have for the second clause ἴδετε ποία ἐστὶν ἡ δόδος ἀγαθή. Similarly, in 1 S 21<sup>9</sup> (3) for the *oratio recta* of the Hebrew, 'and is there not here under thine hand spear or sword?' the Greek text has the indirect question, Ἴδε εἰ ἐστὶν ἐν ταῦθα . . . κ.τ.λ.

The literal translation of Ps 121<sup>1</sup> is, therefore: 'I will lift up mine eyes unto the hills *in order to see* from whence my help will come.' Indeed, the lifting up of the eyes to the hills is itself equivalent to looking about to see.

T. H. WEIR.

Glasgow University.

## Hebrews ii. 9.

IN gratitude for Dr. Garvie's papers may I suggest that his contention, that the words δόξη καὶ τιμὴ ἐστεφανωμένον must on grounds of grammar be taken as describing our Lord as *He approached the Cross*, is further borne out by the fact that both the tenor of the 8th Psalm and the force of the verb עָזַר point to equipment for a task rather than to reward, and that the vexed words χάριτι Θεοῦ are rendered intelligible by those which precede when taken to refer to our Saviour's preparation for His Passion.

It was the 'glory and honour' of the Vanquisher of sin stooping to take on Him the world's

burden, acknowledged at His Baptism and Transfiguration by the Father's voice, that gave to His tasting of death the virtue of a grace of God, a Divine boon, for every man. 'We see Jesus encompassed by the force and worth of His own victory over sin, that so He may with an out-going of Divine love and efficacy taste death's bitterness, and destroy its sting on behalf of every man.'

G. H. WHITAKER.

Souldern Rectory, Oxon.

## Thomas, T<sup>e</sup>ōmah, and T<sup>e</sup>hōm.

WITH reference to the articles in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES for September and October on the character of St. Thomas, it may be worth noting that the real name of the Apostle is unknown. 'Thomas' was not then a personal name, as it has since become. It is simply Aramaic for 'twin,' like the Greek word Didymus, also applied to him. Who his twin brother or sister was, we do not know. But it has often been pointed out that even the name 'twin' is suggestive of his character. For there was a dual nature within him, believing and unbelieving. The conflict between them has been fancifully likened to the strife—pre-natal and post-natal—between Jacob and Esau. And the name suggests other thoughts too. In the *Onomastica Sacra*, the fourth-century list of Biblical names and their supposed derivation edited by Eusebius and St. Jerome, a curious origin is ascribed to the Apostle's name. Its Aramaic form T<sup>e</sup>ōmah is confused with the Hebrew T<sup>e</sup>hōm, which occurs in Gn 1<sup>2</sup> for the Deep, the Abyss. [That word is itself really a proper name, perhaps. It never has the definite article, and may be identical with Tîāmat, the Babylonian Spirit of the Deep.] The similarity of the two words is suggestive of what happened in the spiritual experience of St. Thomas. Over the darkness of his Abyss of Doubt the Spirit was brooding. God said, 'Let there be light! And there was light.'

H. F. B. COMPSTON.

King's and Queen's Colleges, London.

## Entre Nous.

Bishop Gore.

Mr. Leopold B. Hill is the publisher of a series of bijou books containing short selections from the writings of great authors. One of them has come into our hands. It contains *The Golden Sayings of the Right Rev. Bishop Gore* (6d. net). The Bishop of Oxford comes well out of the ordeal. Take this:

'Power; intelligence; love; power from God, intelligence of God and His purposes, love to God in Himself and in His creatures—these make up the content of spirituality.'

William K. Fleming.

Is there anything in this?



## IF ONLY . . .

He moved amid a world of little men,  
Herods and Pilates, scribes, and fisherfolk;  
Some worshipped whatsoe'er He wrought or spoke,

Others devised a devilry of pain,  
And made Him of the greatest of earth's Slain.  
But this we know not—why His dying woke  
Life from the dead and myriads to His yoke:—  
Save that some rumoured He had ris'n again—

Paul said so, keen of wit, though saturate  
With vision—and we half believe in Paul . . .  
But if, before His hurrying days were done,  
Christ had but met some Plato, laureate  
With deathless bays—Buddha, self-reft of all,—  
Or a world-dominant Napoleon! . . .

It is one of the sonnets in Mr. W. K. Fleming's *Dreams and Realities* (Macdonald; 3s. 6d. net). It is a good example of the satirical criticism of modern life to which most of the sonnets are dedicated. But here is another with more seriousness and more music in it:

## THE VOICE OF SIMPLE THINGS.

Oh! well is thee, if thou hast never known  
More knowledge than the hills hold secretly,  
A subtler music than the brooding sea  
Makes for the vocal folds, in undertone  
Of love and sorrow. If thou live alone  
For such pure scholarship, oh! well is thee!—  
Nay, but the world has sung her songs for me,  
And round my feet her poisonous blossoms  
sown.—

Ah! then bethink thee of the path that climbs  
From ledge to ledge of these green precipices;  
Child-faiths shall waken with the sheep-bells'  
chimes,

Courage and ruth at the salt winds' caress:  
Seek not enchantments as at other times,  
But set thy face toward the wilderness!

**A Book of English Poetry.**

Mr. George Beaumont, M.A., has made a selection of English poetry, beginning with John Barbour and ending with Thomas Hardy. The title is *A Book of English Poetry* (Jack; 3s. 6d. net).

A few years ago there appeared a notable collection of English poetry, Quiller-Couch's

*Oxford Book of English Verse*. It seemed sufficient for the rest of a lifetime. But Mr. Beaumont's book quite surpasses it in two directions. It is larger and it is cheaper. A quarto of 580 double-column pages, it is published at 3s. 6d. net. The binding is rather tame, but the paper is light and good.

Of course bigness is not necessarily either beauty or worth. Yet it is one of the advantages of the book. For its great size is due, not to the inclusion of poems of doubtful merit, but to the inclusion of poems of considerable length. Take Milton as an example. Mr. Beaumont has been able to include the Hymn on the Morning of Christ's Nativity, L'Allegro, Il Penseroso, part of Comus, Lycidas, a considerable part of Paradise Lost, some of Paradise Regained, and certain sonnets.

We shall quote two of the later poems as probably least familiar. The first is by J. Drinkwater, the second is by Ronald Ross.

## DOMINION.

I went beneath the sunny sky  
When all things bowed to June's desire,  
The pansy with its steadfast eye,  
The blue shells on the lupin spire,

The swelling fruit along the boughs,  
The grass grown heady in the rain,  
Dark roses fitted for the brows  
Of queens great kings have sung in vain;

My little cat with tiger bars,  
Bright claws all hidden in content;  
Swift birds that flashed like darkling stars  
Across the cloudy continent;

The wiry-coated fellow curled  
Stump-tailed upon the sunny flags;  
The bees that sacked a coloured world  
Of treasure for their honey-bags.

And all these things seemed very glad,  
The sun, the flowers, the birds on wing,  
The jolly beasts, the furry-clad  
Fat bees, the fruit, and everything.

But gladder than them all was I,  
Who, being man, might gather up  
The joy of all beneath the sky,  
And add their treasure to my cup,

And travel every shining way,  
 And laugh with God in God's delight,  
 Create a world for every day,  
 And store a dream for every night.

#### THE INDIAN MOTHER.

Full fed with thoughts and knowledges sublime,  
 And thundering oracles of the gods, that make  
 Man's mind the flower of action and of time,  
 I was one day where beggars come to take  
 Doles ere they die. An Indian mother there,  
 Young, but so wretched that her staring eyes  
 Shone like the winter wolf's with ravening glare  
 Of hunger, struck me. For to much surprise  
 A three-year child well nourish'd at her breast,  
 Wither'd with famine, still she fed and press'd—  
 For she was dying. 'I am too poor,' she  
 said,

'To feed him otherwise'; and with a kiss  
 Fell back and died. And the soul answered,  
 'In spite of all the gods and prophets—this!'

#### Lord Brassey.

Earl Brassey, like many other men of action, has been a great reader, and he has all his life been in the habit of marking or writing out passages that appealed to him most powerfully. Of these passages he has made and published a selection under the title of *Faith and Work* (Longmans; 2s. 6d. net). The volume ought to obtain a large circulation, for its contents are good and it is printed on fine paper and is altogether quite attractive. We obtain an interesting insight into Lord Brassey's reading. His favourite authors have been Stopford Brooke, Phillips Brooks, Carlyle, Jowett, Newman, and Tennyson. There are only three quotations from Browning against nine from Tennyson, which shows that Earl Brassey belongs to the older generation; the proportion would be reversed by Earl Brassey's son. Let us give the solitary quotation from Mrs. Browning. It illustrates the text about God being the giver of every good and perfect gift:

How sure it is  
 That if we say a true word, instantly  
 We feel 'tis God's—not ours.

And let us give another. It is one of five from Christina Rossetti, and illustrates the words, 'As thy days, so shall thy strength be.'

Day that hath no tinge of night,  
 Night that hath no tinge of day,  
 These at last will come to sight  
 Not to fade away.

This is twilight that we know,  
 Scarcely night and scarcely day;  
 This hath been from long ago  
 Shed around man's way:

Step by step to utter night,  
 Step by step to perfect day,  
 To the left hand or the right  
 Leading all away.

This is twilight: be it so;  
 Suited to our strength our day:  
 Let us follow on to know  
 Patient by the way.

#### A. Stodart Walker.

Dr. Walker is the author of *Verses of Consolation*, written in war time (Maclehose; rs. 6d. net). The first is the best, but the following is most characteristic:

#### IN A SLUM.

I never heard him speak a kindly word,  
 My tears were answered with a savage oath;  
 He drank what we could very ill afford;  
 He was a bully and a drunkard both.

He broke my body as he broke my soul,  
 I shivered when I heard his stumbling feet;  
 At times the very household 'sticks' he stole,  
 To pawn and pay for women in the street.

I stitched and laboured for his children's bread,  
 Fourpence a shirt the sweated wage I earned,  
 Save when the doctor forced me to my bed,  
 Where thrice a mother's travail I had learned.

The day he left me for the barrack square,  
 He swore we women were no earthly use  
 For anything but filling men with care;  
 His parting words were words of foul abuse.

And now they tell me of a hero's death,  
 How one to twelve he held the Huns at bay,  
 And won the Cross, yet with his passing breath  
 He bade the chaplain 'take his face away.'



Inside the pubs the neighbours speak his praise,  
The man who brought the world about our slum,  
Or by the open door they stand and gaze,  
And wonder why his slattern wife is dumb.

The preacher dwells the ways of God upon,  
Surpassing man's design and woman's wit;  
Oh God, I can't be sorry he is gone,  
But going I am glad he did his bit.

#### Mu'tamid.

There must be a market for 'The Wisdom of the East,' for Mr. Murray sends out volume after volume, and is undeterred even by the cruelties of the War, cruel to literature as to men. The new volume contains *The Poems of Mu'tamid, King of Seville*, rendered into English verse by Dulcie Lawrence Smith (1s. net). This short poem on Counsel will give some notion of the quality of Mu'tamid's muse and the accomplishment of his translator.

#### COUNSEL.

Friend, I would have you with a sharper wit  
Be censor of the world, and if there be  
One gift, of all wherewith she makes so free,  
That shall endure, I fain would know of it.

Neglect her proffered hand; and if her eye  
Be set against you, then, indifferent still,  
Take leave of her and wander as you will  
Under the clean stars and the unsecret sky.

#### Poems of To-day.

Messrs. Sidgwick & Jackson have published for the English Association a small anthology of *Poems of To-day*. 'The book has been compiled in order that boys and girls, already perhaps familiar with the great classics of the English speech, may also know something of the newer poetry of their own day. Most of the writers are living, and the rest are still vivid memories among us, while one of the youngest, almost as these words are written, has gone singing to lay down his life for his country's cause.'

The selection is done by one who knows modern poetry well. No fewer than forty-seven poets are represented; and scarcely ever is a mistake made in selecting from them. Of course we all have favourites which are not here; but these are the best for boys and girls. Let us be content with one, and let it be by Patrick R. Chalmers:

#### ROUNABOUTS AND SWINGS.

It was early last September nigh to Framlin'am  
on-Sea,  
An' 'twas Fair-day come to-morrow, an' the time  
was after tea,  
An' I met a painted caravan adown a dusty lane,  
A Pharaoh with his waggons comin' jolt an'  
creak an' strain;  
A cheery cove an' sunburnt, bold o' eye and  
wrinkled up,  
An' beside him on the splashboard sat a  
brindled tarrier pup,  
An' a lurcher wise as Solomon an' lean as  
fiddle-strings  
Was joggin' in the dust along 'is roundabouts  
and swings.

'Goo'-day,' said 'e; 'Goo'-day,' said I; 'an' 'ow  
d'you find things go,  
An' what's the chance o' millions when you runs  
a travellin' show?'  
'I find,' said 'e, 'things very much as 'ow I've  
always found,  
For mostly they goes up and down or else goes  
round and round.'  
Said 'e, 'The job's—the very spit o' what it  
always were,  
It's bread and bacon mostly when the dog don't  
catch a 'are;  
But lookin' at it broad, an' while it ain't no  
merchant king's,  
What's lost upon the roundabouts we pulls up  
on the swings!'

'Goo' luck,' said 'e; 'Goo' luck,' said I; 'you've  
put it past a doubt;  
An' keep that lurcher on the road, the game-  
keepers is out';  
'E thumped upon the footboard an' 'e lumbered  
on again  
To meet a gold-dust sunset down the owl-light  
in the lane;  
An' the moon she climbed the 'azels, while a  
nightjar seemed to spin  
That Pharaoh's wisdom o'er again, 'is sooth of  
lose-and-win;  
For 'up an' down an' round,' said 'e, 'goes all  
appointed things,  
An' losses on the roundabouts means profits on  
the swings!'



Bruce Malaher.

There is no effort at fine effect whether of idea or of expression in the poetry of Mr. Malaher. All is on the level of universal human experience. And so all finds response at once. Here, out of *A Legend from Wicklow* (Stoneham; 2s. 6d. net), is a poem on the Cuckoo, as sweet and fitting as words can accomplish.

#### THE CUCKOO.

Haunting, haunting melody  
Coming o'er the hills to me,  
Wafted on the evening breeze  
Voices calling in the trees  
Cuckoo, cuckoo.

Sweeter music never could  
Echo through the leafy wood  
Than that singing, low and clear  
Calling distant, calling near,  
Cuckoo, cuckoo.

How I love to hear you sing,  
Little harbinger of Spring,  
Memories are stirred again  
By your friendly soft refrain  
Cuckoo, cuckoo.

Anatole France.

Mr. John Lane has issued another volume of his attractive edition of the works of Anatole France in English. Its title is *Crainquebille, Putois, Riquet, and other Profitable Tales* (6s.). Its excellent translation has been made by Winifred Stephens. One of the 'profitable tales' is called 'The Ocean Christ.' Are we able to profit by it? This is the tale.

#### THE OCEAN CHRIST.

That year many of the fishers of Saint-Valéry had been drowned at sea. Their bodies were found on the beach cast up by the waves with the wreckage of their boats; and for nine days, up the steep road leading to the church were to be seen coffins borne by hand and followed by widows, who were weeping beneath their great black-hooded cloaks, like women in the Bible.

Thus were the skipper Jean Lenoël and his son Désiré laid in the great nave, beneath the vaulted roof from which they had once hung a ship in full rigging as an offering to Our Lady. They were righteous men and God-fearing. Monsieur Guillaume Truphème, priest of Saint-Valéry, having pronounced the Absolution, said in a tearful voice:

'Never were laid in consecrated ground there to await the judgment of God better men and better Christians than Jean Lenoël and his son Désiré.'

And while barques and their skippers perished near the coast, in the high seas great vessels foundered. Not a day passed that the ocean did not bring in some flotsam of wreck. Now one morning some children who were steering a boat saw a figure lying on the sea. It was a figure of Jesus Christ, life-size, carved in wood, painted in natural colouring, and looking as if it were very old. The Good Lord was floating upon the sea with arms outstretched. The children towed the figure ashore and brought it up into Saint-Valéry. The head was encircled with a crown of thorns. The feet and hands were pierced. But the nails were missing as well as the cross. The arms were still outstretched ready for sacrifice and blessing, just as He appeared to Joseph of Arimathea and the holy women when they were burying Him.

The children gave it to Monsieur le Curé Truphème, who said to them:

'This image of the Saviour is of ancient workmanship. He who made it must have died long ago. Although to-day in the shops of Amiens and Paris excellent statues are sold for a hundred francs and more, we must admit that the earlier sculptors were not without merit. But what delights me most is the thought that if Jesus Christ be thus come with open arms to Saint-Valéry, it is in order to bless the parish, which has been so cruelly tried, and in order to announce that He has compassion on the poor folk who go a-fishing at the risk of their lives. He is the God who walked upon the sea and blessed the nets of Cephas.'

And Monsieur le Curé Truphème, having had the Christ placed in the church on the cloth of the high altar, went off to order from the carpenter Lemerre a beautiful cross in heart of oak.

When it was made, the Saviour was nailed to it with brand new nails, and it was erected in the nave above the churchwarden's pew.

Then it was noticed that His eyes were filled with mercy and seemed to glisten with tears of heavenly pity.

One of the churchwardens, who was present at the putting up of the crucifix, fancied he saw tears streaming down the divine face. The next morning when Monsieur le Curé with a choir-boy entered the church to say his mass, he was astonished to



find the cross above the churchwarden's pew empty and the Christ lying upon the altar.

As soon as he had celebrated the Divine Sacrifice he had the carpenter called and asked him why he had taken the Christ down from His cross. But the carpenter replied that he had not touched it. Then, after having questioned the beadle and the sidesmen, Monsieur Truphème made certain that no one had entered the church since the crucifix had been placed over the churchwarden's pew.

Thereupon he felt that these things were miraculous, and he meditated upon them discreetly. The following Sunday in his exhortation he spoke of them to his parishioners, and he called upon them to contribute by their gifts to the erection of a new cross more beautiful than the first and more worthy to bear the Redeemer of the world.

The poor fishers of Saint-Valéry gave as much money as they could and the widows brought their wedding-rings. Wherefore Monsieur Truphème was able to go at once to Abbeville and to order a cross of ebony, highly polished and surmounted by a scroll with the inscription I.N.R.I. in letters of gold. Two months later it was erected in the place of the former, and the Christ was nailed to it between the lance and the sponge.

But Jesus left this cross as He had left the other; and as soon as night fell He went and stretched Himself upon the altar.

Monsieur le Curé, when he found Him there in the morning, fell on his knees and prayed for a long while. The fame of this miracle spread throughout the neighbourhood, and the ladies of Amiens made a collection for the Christ of Saint-Valéry. Monsieur Truphème received money and jewels from Paris, and the wife of the Minister of Marine, Madame Hyde de Neuville, sent him a heart of diamonds. Of all these treasures, in the space of two years, a goldsmith of La Rue St. Sulpice, fashioned a cross of gold and precious stones which was set up with great pomp in the church of Saint-Valéry on the second Sunday after Easter in the year 18—. But He who had not refused the cross of sorrow, fled from this cross of gold and again stretched Himself upon the white linen of the altar.

For fear of offending Him, He was left there this time; and He had lain upon the altar for more than two years, when Pierre, son of Pierre Caillou, came to tell Monsieur le Curé Truphème that he had found the true cross of Our Lord on the beach.

Pierre was an innocent; and, because he had not sense enough to earn a livelihood, people gave him bread out of charity, he was liked because he never did any harm. But he wandered in his talk and no one listened to him.

Nevertheless Monsieur Truphème, who had never ceased meditating on the Ocean Christ, was struck by what the poor imbecile had just said. With the beadle and two sidesmen he went to the spot, where the child said he had seen the cross, and there he found two planks studded with nails, which had long been washed by the sea and which did indeed form a cross.

They were the remains of some old shipwreck. On one of these boards could still be read two letters painted in black, a J and an L; and there was no doubt that this was a fragment of Jean Lenoël's barque, he who with his son Désiré had been lost at sea five years before.

At the sight of this, the beadle and the sidesmen began to laugh at the innocent who had taken the broken planks of a boat for the cross of Jesus Christ. But Monsieur le Curé Truphème checked their merriment. He had meditated much and prayed long since the Ocean Christ had arrived among the fisherfolk, and the mystery of infinite charity began to dawn upon him. He knelt down upon the sand, repeated the prayer for the faithful departed, and then told the beadle and the sidesmen to carry the flotsam on their shoulders and to place it in the church. When this had been done he raised the Christ from the altar, placed it on the planks of the boat and himself nailed it to them, with the nails that the ocean had corroded.

By the priest's command, the very next day this cross took the place of the cross of gold and precious stones over the churchwarden's pew. The Ocean Christ has never left it. He has chosen to remain nailed to the planks on which men died invoking His name and that of His Mother. There, with parted lips, august and afflicted He seems to say:

'My cross is made of all men's woes, for I am in truth the God of the poor and the heavy-laden.'

---

Printed by MORRISON & GIBB LIMITED, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. CLARK, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to THE EDITOR, Kings Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.